

With the compliments of
James T. Seymour
66 Broadway
New York

Personal Reminiscences

OF

James A. *Alexander* Scrymser

In Times of Peace and War

COPYRIGHT, 1915
By JAMES A. SCRYMSER

MAR 11 1915

©CL 4397085

ILLUSTRATIONS

- ✓ James A. Scrymser.
The Engineer Corps, Twelfth New York Militia, in the Civil War.
- ✓ Major-General Francis C. Barlow, U. S. A.
- ✓ Letter of General Smith to Captain Scrymser.
- ✓ The Rally of the Vermont Brigade.
- ✓ Major-General William Farrar Smith, U. S. A.
- ✓ John Pierpont Morgan.
- ✓ Chapel at West Point.
- ✓ Washington Statue.
- ✓ Picture of Grand Review of the Japanese Army, with Field Marshal Oyama's Signature.
- ✓ Century House, Harlem River, 1861.
- ✓ Alfred Pell.
- ✓ Central and South American Telegraph Co. Building, Buenos Aires, Argentine.
- ✓ Cable Map.
- ✓ Genius of Electricity.
- ✓ Count Ferdinand de Lesseps.
- ✓ Rev. Charles H. Parkhurst, D.D.
- ✓ United Charities Building, New York City.
- ✓ The Memorial to the Heroic Women of the Civil War, Washington. The Headquarters of the American Red Cross.
- ✓ Miss Mabel T. Boardman.



FOREWORD

This book of personal reminiscences and comment is published for my friends.

From time to time I have related incidents of the Civil War and of my activities after the War, and numerous friends have been good enough to suggest their compilation in book form.

Inasmuch as the book is for private circulation only—among friends—its readers will, I am sure, be lenient in their judgment of both its defects and the necessary frequent intrusion of the “first person.”

If anything be found between the covers of this book which shall prove of interest to any of my old comrades or acquaintances, or an incentive to any of my younger friends to be ever on the alert to “seize the opportunity”—the ability to do so being the keynote of success—I shall be satisfied.

JAMES A. SCRYMSE

New York, February, 1915

CONTENTS

	Page
IN THE CIVIL WAR:	
General and Mrs. Francis C. Barlow.....	9
Brief Synopsis of My Civil War Service.....	14
The Opinion of the Fort Sumter Confederates Regarding the Seventh Regiment of New York.....	16
In President Lincoln's Kitchen.....	17
General Franklin's Prophecy.....	19
Lieutenant George A. Custer.....	20
Near Richmond, June, 1862.....	22
The Recovered Gun.....	26
The Retreat from Malvern Hill.....	29
The Rally of the Vermont Brigade.....	31
The Ending of the Battle of Antietam.....	34
The Reading of the Emancipation Proclamation.....	36
The Army of the Potomac "Not Demoralized".....	38
General "Ben" Butler.....	39
Mr. Choate's "Argument" in the General Fitz-John Porter Re- Hearing.....	40
The "Great Conspiracy".....	41
Citizenry-Trained Soldiers.....	42
MISCELLANEOUS INCIDENTS:	
Mayor Hewitt in England.....	43
"English as She is Spoke".....	44
Hon. Roscoe Conkling.....	45
Public Schools in England.....	46
Interview with Baron De Rothschild.....	48
The Minister of the Interior.....	51
A Hired Coach and Livery in the City of Mexico.....	53
Namesakes.....	55
J. P. Morgan and President Cleveland's Anti-Bond Issue.....	56
A Dinner in Honor of General Scott and Admiral Farragut.....	58
West Point.....	59
The Use of "Influence".....	62
Cuban Independence.....	64
Field Marshal Oyama.....	66
THE HISTORY OF THREE CABLE COMPANIES:	
International Ocean Telegraph Company.....	67
Mexican Telegraph Company.....	75

	Page
Central and South American Telegraph Company.....	77
Map of the Mexican and Central and South American Telegraph Co.'s Systems	79
"Genius of Electricity".....	80
Extension to Brazil.....	81
Side-Lights on Cable Management.....	83
Wireless Competition.....	85
Mr. Jay Gould's Opposition.....	86
Count Ferdinand de Lesseps.....	89
 VALUE OF AMERICAN-OWNED CABLES TO THE AMERICAN GOVERNMENT AND NECESSITY OF GOVERNMENTAL JURISDICTION:	
Cable Connections during the Spanish American War.....	92
Wireless Telegraphy.....	102
Landing of Original French Cable Company.....	106
 CIVIC INTERESTS AND CHARITIES:	
The Parkhurst Campaign, "Lest We Forget".....	109
Public Schools in New York.....	126
Vacation Schools.....	135
United Charities Building.....	137
 MEMORIAL TO THE WOMEN OF THE CIVIL WAR:	
American Red Cross Building, in Washington.....	139

General and Mrs. Francis C. Barlow

IN July, 1860, there was a party of young men who made a daily trip on the steamboat "*Edwin*," then plying between New York and Yonkers. As one may imagine, the conversations at that time were decidedly animated. Lincoln and Hamlin and Bell and Everett had just been nominated by their respective parties and, of course, politics was the chief talk of the day.

One of the party was Francis C. Barlow, a brilliant Harvard graduate and subsequently a Major-General in the United States Army. Barlow was a close personal friend of mine and we saw much of each other in those days.

One afternoon the political discussion became serious. It was a time for sober-mindedness. I remember Barlow particularly that day. He was a good listener and had little to say but when he did speak he commanded attention. After a rather heated discussion, Barlow interrupted by saying, "You may talk politics until you are deaf and dumb but slavery in this country can be ended only by war, and war is sure to come, and all of you must be prepared to enlist." I replied, "Frank, I will, if you will."

Nine months later President Lincoln issued his call for seventy-five thousand volunteers!

I shall never forget April 20, 1861, nor a note I received from Barlow bearing the date. The note simply read:

The time has come, remember your promise. Meet me at Delmonico's at four o'clock to-day, Saturday, and we will enlist.

F. C. BARLOW.

We met promptly at four o'clock at the appointed place and wandered up Broadway. That thoroughfare was a glorious sight; many of the buildings were decorated with flags and patriotic emblems and the martial spirit was everywhere in evidence. Recruiting squads, with fife and drums and flags, were parading the

street with recruits and these recruits were later escorted to the armories and there enrolled.

Barlow and I had formed no definite plan of enlisting and decided to look around before doing so. We visited several armories, finally arriving in front of the Twelfth New York State Militia Armory, Colonel Daniel Butterfield. The Twelfth Regiment Armory was on Broadway just north of the old Metropolitan Hotel.


On the doorstep of the armory I recognized a friend of mine, Capt. Alfred Jones, in gorgeous uniform. I hailed him and asked what regiment he belonged to and what was his rank? Jones replied, "It's the Twelfth Regiment of New York and I am its Chaplain and it's a d—n good regiment!"

The remark seemed to captivate Barlow, who declared that a regiment that had a Chaplain who could swear was the regiment in which we should enlist, and enlist we did, in the engineer corps as Third Sergeants. The Company Sergeant ordered us to report at midnight. Barlow demurred slightly to this order, explaining to the Sergeant that he was going uptown to be married. He promised, however, to report for duty at daylight the next morning.

The following morning, Sunday, April 21st, the Twelfth Regiment, one thousand strong, was deployed on Union Square, the right resting on Fourteenth Street. It was an exciting time: crowds were rushing to and fro, goodbyes were being said and enthusiastic "God bless yous" were heard on every side.

On the corner of Fourteenth Street and Broadway I noticed a lady, dressed in black and crying, and was surprised to see that she was joined in a few minutes by my friend Barlow. Barlow straightway called me and presented me to his "bride," Mrs. Francis C. Barlow *née* Miss Arabella Griffiths. Barlow looked like anything but a married man. He did not appear to be more than twenty years of age, looked like a boy, and weighed less than 135 pounds.

The regiment sailed that noon on the steamship "*Baltic*" for Annapolis, Maryland.



THE ENGINEER CORPS, 12TH NEW YORK MILITIA IN THE CIVIL WAR

The man seated on the right of the picture is Sergt. Barlow, and seated next to him is Sergt. Seymour

The next time that I saw Mrs. Barlow was in Washington, in May, 1861, at the Twelfth Regiment camp. Barlow had been commissioned a Captain and, with the regiment, had been transferred to Harpers Ferry. I was left in charge of the camp guard at Washington.

On a Sunday morning I was at the guard house and overheard Mrs. Barlow insisting upon her right to visit the late quarters of her husband, Capt. Barlow. I heard the Sergeant of the Guard reply, "Madame, you can't play that on me; that boy is no husband of your'n." I then appeared upon the scene and was able to relieve Mrs. Barlow's embarrassment and testify to the fact that she was Capt. Barlow's wife, so securing her admittance to the camp.

I did not see Mrs. Barlow again for over a year, when we met on the Hagerstown Turnpike, about a mile north of Dunker Church—during the Battle of Antietam, September 17, 1862. Mrs. Barlow had left Hagerstown at midnight, accompanied by a negro servant with a wheelbarrow on which was her trunk and a bandbox.

The battle was raging with fury for two miles to the south of us and the Hagerstown Road was necessarily exposed to the artillery fire of both armies. Realizing her danger, I escorted Mrs. Barlow well to the east of the high-road and directed her to a field hospital at Mummas Farm.

About noon, I saw Barlow, terribly wounded, being carried on a stretcher and I arranged immediately to have Mrs. Barlow join him. By her careful nursing his life was saved.


The next appearance of Mrs. Barlow, of which I have knowledge, was at the Battle of Gettysburg, in July, 1863. There, in a most heroic manner, she again saved her husband's life. General Barlow was seriously wounded in the first day's battle, July 1st, while serving under General Reynolds. General Barlow's command, a division, had fallen back and in doing so were obliged to leave General Barlow on the roadside crossing of the Gettysburg and Carlisle Roads. While General Barlow was lying there, the Confederate Generals, Early and Gordon, passed by with a troop of cavalry. Gordon discovered Barlow by the roadside and remarked, within Barlow's hearing, "General Early, there is a

Yankee General, perhaps we can do something for him." General Early looked at Barlow and replied, "No, he is too far gone." Thereupon Barlow raised himself upon his elbow, with difficulty, and, shaking his fist, said, "General Early, I will live to lick you yet, damn you." General Gordon then dismounted and gave Barlow a drink from his flask. Barlow took from his coat pocket a batch of letters, saying, "General Gordon, these letters are from my wife; if I die, destroy them; if I live, keep them for me."

At this time, Mrs. Barlow was with General Hancock's command which, it will be recalled, did not reach Gettysburg until the evening of the first day's fight. Hearing of General Barlow's injury, Mrs. Barlow begged General Hancock for permission to pass through the lines to care for her husband. General Hancock, fearing that the enemy would learn that the Army of the Potomac was then concentrated at Gettysburg, refused permission. Nothing daunted, Mrs. Barlow herself found the way to Culp's Hill, where the lines were very close together and, at daylight on July 2nd, she ran from our side to the enemy's, and it is said both sides fired on her. She was not hurt, however, and within half an hour she was with her husband and her nursing and tender care were undoubtedly the means of again saving General Barlow for the Union cause.

Right here, it is interesting to make note of the fact that in the Battle of the Wilderness, in May, 1864, General Barlow fulfilled his threat to General Early and succeeded in capturing most of General Early's command and sixteen of his guns. Barlow himself was desperately wounded, for the third time. He was transferred to a Washington hospital on a Sanitary Commission steamboat, *via* Aquia Creek. During the trip, he was interviewed by an elderly Sanitary Commission officer, who tenderly asked, "My dear boy, are you badly wounded?" Imagine the elderly officer's astonishment when Barlow replied: "I am not a boy, I am a Major-General of the United States Army!"

At the Washington hospital, he was again nursed to life and health by his noble wife. This heroic woman died of camp fever shortly before the close of the war. Mrs. Barlow's services to the Union can never be fully appreciated. She was but one of that noble army of loyal women whose lives of courage, service and



MAJOR-GENERAL FRANCIS C. BARLOW

General Barlow is on the extreme left of the picture, leaning against a tree
From the "Photographic History of the Civil War," reproduced by permission
of the *Review of Reviews* Co.

Copyright, 1911, by *Review of Reviews* Co.

sacrifice did so much for the cause of the Union in the dark days of the Civil War. The heroism of Mrs. Barlow inspired my suggestion of a memorial in Washington, to the memory of the women of the Civil War, referred to in another article.

After the war, General Barlow was elected Attorney-General of the State of New York and, later, Secretary of State.

General Barlow died in 1896. During his illness and particularly just before his death, I saw him frequently. In my last interview with him our conversation drifted back to the early days of the war. General Barlow frequently spoke of his wife, "Arabella," as he called her, and I remember well his prophecy at that moment—that the time would come when the finest monument in this country would be built to the memory of the loyal women of the Civil War. Despite his illness, General Barlow grew enthusiastic upon the subject and said that some one should take the lead in reminding the country of the immense debt of gratitude which it owed to the heroic women of the war and I then and there promised him that I would do all that I could do to carry out his wishes and to see that his prophecy was fulfilled.

Brief Synopsis of My Civil War Service

IN the preceding article I have referred to my enlistment April 20, 1861, in the Twelfth Regiment of New York and its departure for the front.

In June, 1861, the Twelfth was stationed near Fairfax Seminary, Virginia. Shortly after our arrival there a Captain Smith of the Topographical Engineers, United States Army (subsequently Major-General William F. Smith), applied to Colonel Butterfield, of the Twelfth, for an assistant, to aid him in his surveying work preparatory to the construction of fortifications west of Alexandria, on Fairfax Heights.

It fell to my lot to be detailed to assist Captain Smith and a large part of my work consisted in taking field notes of his surveys. I served with him, in this way, for about two weeks. The Twelfth Regiment returned to New York in August, 1861, having served its period of enlistment, three months.

In the month of September following, I was surprised to receive a note from Captain Smith informing me that he had been nominated as a Brigadier-General and, as such, would have command of the Vermont Brigade. The note recalled the services which I had rendered as his assistant in the field surveys, two months earlier, and contained a very kind offer of a position as Captain and Aide-de-Camp in his military family.

Under the Army regulations of that period, the Commanding General of the Army had the appointment of forty Captains and Aide-de-Camps, to be detailed to serve as such with the various Division and Brigade Commanders of the Commanding General. It seems that the Congress of the United States jumped at the conclusion that these forty Captains and Aide-de-Camps were to serve solely on the staff of General McClellan and this resulted finally in the repeal of the Army regulation referred to. In consequence, my appointment as Captain and Aide-de-Camp was officially annulled and I had the pleasure of serving as Captain and

Headquarters Ninth Army Corps.

Swampscott Mass Ma
Feb 7 26th 1863

My Dear Capt

I cannot-
accept your resignation
without expressing to you my
appreciation of the services
you have rendered to the
Country since you have been
attached to my Staff. Always
ready & willing your zeal,
industry & gallantry have
been so conspicuous as to
deserve my warm thanks.
On returning to civil life
you go with the consciousness
of having done so much as
to entitle you to leave
service without fear of
incompensation & with the
best wishes of all you
have behind you here.

Yours Ever Friend

Wm. F. Smith
Maj Genl
Comdr 9th Corps

Aide-de-Camp for about four months without either official rank or pay.

General Smith obtained for me a Lieutenancy in the Forty-third New York Volunteers and had me detailed and nominated as a Captain and Aide-de-Camp on his staff. I served in this capacity until February 26, 1863, at which time I resigned, General Smith having been assigned to civil duty in the Department of the Gulf, to investigate the doings of Generals Butler and Banks. In this investigation he was assisted by Honorable James T. Brady, an eminent New York lawyer.

In April, 1864, General Smith was assigned to the command of a division in the Army of the James commanded by General Benjamin F. Butler, whom he had investigated a year before. Upon this assignment of General Smith I volunteered to serve and was in the official orders named as Volunteer Captain until June, 1864.

In my Civil War career I served in the Battles of Yorktown, Williamsburg, Mechanicsville, Seven Pines, Gaines Mill, Garnett's Farm, Savage Station, White Oak Swamp, Malvern Hill, Second Bull Run, Antietam, Fredericksburg, Cold Harbor, Balls Bluff, Petersburg, and many skirmishes.

Later, because of differences between General Smith and General Butler, the former was relieved of his command, whereupon I resigned my volunteer service. General Smith was subsequently appointed Chief Engineer in the Army of the Cumberland in which position he planned and directed the operations which led to the Battles of Lookout Mountain and Missionary Ridge and the relief of Chattanooga.

None of General Smith's staff received any brevet rank for their services in the War of the Rebellion. This was due to General Smith's failure to file his recommendations with the War Department in time. When these recommendations were finally filed they were outlawed by an act of Congress, March 1, 1869, which provided that on and after that date commissions by brevet should be conferred only in time of war.

The Opinion of the Fort Sumter Confederates Regarding the Seventh Regiment of New York

SHORTLY after the fall of Fort Sumter, the citizens of Charleston, South Carolina, tendered a banquet, at the Pulaski House, to the Southern officers who commanded the batteries which caused the surrender. Among those present at the banquet was Mr. Samuel Ward, of New York, who has told this story.

It seems that during the banquet a telegraph message was handed to Mr. Ward, and, Mr. Ward being a Northerner, there was naturally much curiosity among those present to learn the contents of the message. In response to the urgent inquiries of the others, Mr. Ward finally replied, "Gentlemen, you will not be pleased with the contents of this message, but, as you insist, I will read it to you. The message says:

The Seventh Regiment, twelve hundred strong, left New York to-day for the defense of Washington.

The reading of the message was greeted with loud laughter and derision. When order was restored, Mr. Ward said, "Gentlemen, you misinterpret the message. It means far more than you imagine, it means that the North is a unit and that the North's best blood, with its wealth, is opposed to you. Gentlemen, you are beaten!"

In President Lincoln's Kitchen

WHEN the Twelfth New York Militia left New York for Washington, April 21, 1861, I was one of the Engineer Company. Colonel (afterward General) Butterfield commanding was then very much of a "society" man, and we had been in Washington but a few days when he became very intimate at the White House, and particularly so with Mrs. Lincoln. Out of this came an incident in which Mr. Lincoln appeared for the first time in Washington in one of those homely relations with which afterwards the public were to become so familiar through so many reminiscences. Mrs. Lincoln told Colonel Butterfield that the White House cook was in trouble—the "waterback" of the range was out of order. "Couldn't he have it fixed that day—perhaps he had some soldier plumbers?" Of course he had—the Twelfth was full of 'em (probably he would have offered to furnish aeronauts or lion-tamers if she had wanted any)—and promptly he made a requisition on the Quartermaster,—or perhaps it was the Adjutant—for plumbers to go to the White House. The Adjutant, who knew little and cared less about the matter, slid it over to the Engineer Company: "Wanted, plumbers for the White House, by order Colonel Butterfield." But none of the Company were plumbers—we ranked as non-commissioned officers, and one of us—Frank Barlow—ranked as Major-General later—and perhaps we did not feel complimented even by the chance of a "job" at the White House. But I ventured the opinion that there probably were some plumbers—in other companies—and so was detailed to get them. I did—four—and went along to "boss the job." It certainly was a sight—four uniformed militiamen, with arms and accoutrements, marching into the White House kitchen, with an admiring group of colored servants looking on. We "stacked arms" and in a few minutes the range was yanked out, and set in the middle of the kitchen, and four able-bodied New York plumbers were wrestling with its waterback. The details of the job have escaped my memory, but

not so my—and our—first sight of Mr. Lincoln. He came down to the kitchen, and half-sitting, half-leaning on the kitchen table, and holding one knee in his hands, the Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy said: "Well, boys, I certainly am glad to see you. I hope you can fix that thing right off; for if you can't, the cook can't use the range, and I don't suppose I'll get any 'grub' to-day!" It was a Saturday, possibly the President was also thinking of his Sunday dinner.

How the Twelfth saved the Presidential dinner ought to be writ large in the regimental history. I know not if any of my four comrades of that occasion are living, but if any of them see the story in print I am sure they will remember the event.

General Franklin's Prophecy

IN December, 1861, General "Baldy" Smith, had for his headquarters the Smoot House, a substantial double brick building about eleven miles from Washington, near a place called Lewinsville, Va.

On the second Saturday in December, as I remember, there was an impromptu luncheon party at these headquarters. The luncheon was attended by General McClellan, General Meade, General McCall, General Fitz-John Porter, General Hancock, General W. T. H. Brooks and General Franklin, General Smith acting as host. After the luncheon, I, with other members of General Smith's staff, was invited to join the party, and I recall the discussion which ensued as to the probable duration of the war. It appeared to be the unanimous opinion that the war would last for some years.

It was then that General Franklin vouchsafed a remarkable prophecy, substantially as follows:

It is my opinion that the war will continue for several years and, before the war is over, every one present, with one exception, will be laid away on the shelf. That exception will be General George G. Meade; he will come out on top at the close of the war.

It was, as I have said, a remarkable prediction, inasmuch as it proved to be such a true one.

It is regrettable that General Meade himself was so overshadowed by General Grant that Meade's great services as Commander of the Army of the Potomac were never fully appreciated, and that Meade never received the recognition to which he was so justly entitled.

Lieutenant George A. Custer

DURING the siege operations before Yorktown, in the Spring of 1862, Lieutenant George A. Custer, later the famous cavalry general and Indian fighter, was assigned to duty as an engineer on the staff of General "Baldy" Smith. We were advancing from White House Station, on the Pamunkey River, to Richmond, and General Smith's division was at the head of the column.

A story in connection with Custer at this time will, I am sure, be well worth recording.

It all happened on a perfect day in June. The head of the column had halted in a field adjoining Dr. Gaines' house—about opposite Meadow Bridge, which crossed the Chickahominy at that point. The field itself was a bluff some fifty or seventy-five feet above the valley and the latter, for about two miles, appeared to be one vast wheat field—from Meadow Bridge westward to the Mechanicsville Bridge. The wheat was just ripening and its golden color contrasted strongly with the green of the willow trees on the banks of the Chickahominy River, winding its way through the fields.

As General Smith and his staff were enjoying this superb view, which embraced in the distance the church spires of Richmond, General McClellan and his staff rode up.

General McClellan's first remark was addressed to General Smith; it was a query as to whether the Chickahominy River was fordable. Before General Smith could answer, Lieutenant Custer, hastily saluting McClellan, jumped on his horse, remarking as he did so, "General, I will find out." Reining up his horse, Custer leaped a five-rail fence and galloped down the hillside to the wheat field below. As he approached the line of willows, on the banks of the Chickahominy, he was obliged to ride Indian fashion—that is, by throwing himself on the offside of his horse, as the Confederate sharpshooters, along the river bank, opened fire on him.

Custer galloped toward Meadow Bridge and we saw the horse and rider disappear in the line of willows. In a few moments, to our great delight, we saw the horse again, scrambling up the river bank, with Custer once more throwing himself on the off-side. At a gallop he came through the wheat fields and soon returned to where we were all standing. When he reached us, Custer dismounted from his horse, saluted General McClellan and handed him a branch of willow which he carried, saying, "The river is fordable, General, this willow is from the other side."

General McClellan immediately asked Custer his name and Custer replied, "Second Lieutenant Custer, Fifth Cavalry." "*Captain* Custer," General McClellan responded, "you will report to my headquarters this afternoon for duty on my staff. I compliment you upon your gallantry and the valuable information you have obtained."

This was the beginning of Custer's wonderful career, and I have often wondered why some of General McClellan's staff, in fact some of General Smith's staff, did not "seize the opportunity," as Custer did.

Near Richmond, June, 1862

THE Battle of Gaines Mill was fought on June 27, 1862. General Fitz-John Porter was in command and was later reinforced by General Slocum's division and the Irish Brigade, under General Meagher. The Army of the Potomac was cut in two by the Chickahominy Valley, General Porter being in command of all the troops on the north of the Valley and General William B. Franklin and General Sumner on the south side of the Chickahominy. The joint command on the south side comprised about 60,000 men.

Previous to the battle of Gaines Mill, General Lee had adroitly crossed the Chickahominy at Mechanicsville, five miles north of Richmond. He was joined two days after by General Stonewall Jackson, fresh from his remarkable and successful campaign in the Shenandoah Valley. General Jackson must have made a marvelously quick march to have been able to reach General Lee so soon.

General Porter's battle at Gaines Mill was one of the most desperate of the whole war and no good reason has ever been given why the 60,000 men on the south side of the Chickahominy Valley and within sight of the battlefield on the north bank, were not sent to the assistance of General Porter, who was obliged to fight nearly the whole of General Lee's army, together with that of General Jackson.

The night after the battle of Gaines Mill, General Porter crossed the Chickahominy at Trent House, some three miles south of General Franklin's line of works four miles from Richmond. It was evident to General Franklin, and other officers, that General Lee had withdrawn nearly all of his troops for the Battle of Gaines Mill and that he had left but a thin line between the 60,000 Union soldiers and the City of Richmond.

The second day after the battle of Gaines Mill, General McClellan determined to make his celebrated change of base and accordingly withdrew his whole army from in front of Richmond,

marching it to the banks of the James River by way of White Oak Swamp and Malvern Hill. General "Baldy" Smith, of Franklin's left grand division, formed the rear guard. Immediately in front of General Smith's command, which occupied the extreme right, were the Confederate troops that General Lee had left on the south side of the Chickahominy—about 10,000 men. The Confederates were in a line on what was then known as Dr. Garnett's farm. On the Union side there was a line of trenches a quarter of a mile, or more, in length. These trenches faced west. On the Confederate side there was a redoubt in an open field and several lines of intrenchments.

The Confederates soon discovered that McClellan was withdrawing, and, as usual in such cases, immediately opened an attack upon the Union rear guard.

The Confederate command comprised a division, or more, composed largely of Georgia troops, in command of General Cobb. As an Aide-de-camp to General Smith, I was on duty in the advance line of works and, from my position, saw the Confederate division, in three lines, coming across the open field double quick and with their customary "rebel yell." The Confederates had to cover about two hundred yards and came on straight for our line of works, which were largely occupied by General Smith's division. The Confederate brigade commander was some ten yards in advance of his attacking force, and friend and foe alike could not but admire his splendid bravery. This commander, who it later transpired, was a Colonel Lamar, finally fell on the parapet, within ten feet of where I was standing. He was terribly wounded in the thigh.

One of our company officers carried Colonel Lamar's sword to General Smith, explaining that he had captured the Colonel and several of his soldiers! I at once informed General Smith of the gallant manner in which Colonel Lamar had led his men and, also, reported that two of our own officers had been taken prisoners after the *melée* in the trenches, from which the Confederates had been driven back to their own lines.

General Smith immediately ordered the officer who had brought in Colonel Lamar's sword to return the sword to Colonel Lamar with General Smith's compliments and to say that "General

Smith returned the sword because any one who led his men as gallantly as had Lamar was entitled to keep it."

I then suggested to General Smith that as Colonel Lamar was so badly wounded it might be well to exchange him for the two Union officers, captured and held by the Confederates. General Smith assented to this suggestion and, under a flag of truce, we exchanged a wounded Confederate Colonel for two able-bodied Union officers. Colonel Lamar came of a well-known Georgia family. He was a nephew of Senator Lamar of Mississippi, who was subsequently a member of the Supreme Court of the United States.

A number of years after the war, I think it was in the Spring of 1869, I happened to be in the gallery of the Senate Chamber in Washington and there heard the first discussion on silver. At that time it was well known that Senator Conkling, of New York, was leaning toward the silver side of the question and, as soon as the Bill was called, I observed that he left his chair and sauntered into the lobby, thereby avoiding the vote which was about to be taken. As a New Yorker I was not proud of the scene.

As the vote of the States was called, Senator Lamar, the Senator from Mississippi, sent to the desk a document with the request that it should be read to the Senate. The document proved to be iron-clad instructions from the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, directing Senator Lamar to cast his vote for silver. After reading the document, the Chair turned to the Senator and asked "And how does the Senator from Mississippi vote?" With a firm voice, Senator Lamar replied, "I vote No," whereupon there was loud applause throughout the gallery of the Senate. The Senator had voted in accordance with his convictions and had refused to follow the instructions of the Legislature of his own State.

I insert this story here because it seems to fit in so well with the story of the wounded Colonel Lamar, of 1862. The withdrawal of Senator Conkling from the Senate Chamber and the courageous stand of Senator Lamar suggested to me, that "exchanges" were again in order and that it might be well for the State of New York to exchange Senator Conkling for Senator Lamar.

The particulars of these two events, the fight at Garnett's Farm and the first vote on silver in the Senate, were embodied in a letter which I sent to Senator Lamar, inquiring if he was the Colonel whose exchange I had negotiated at the battle on the Farm in June, 1862. To my inquiry, Senator Lamar replied that the Colonel referred to was a nephew of his, and he added the information that there had been sixteen Lamars in the Confederate Army.

The Recovered Gun

DURING the Battle of Gaines Mills, General Butterfield commanded the Brigade on the extreme left of General Fitz-John Porter's Army. This formation brought the left of Butterfield's Brigade well down into the Chickahominy Valley. The Sixth Army Corps, commanded by General "Baldy" Smith, was on the south side of the Chickahominy, from which point it maintained a lively artillery fire, serving to hold the Confederates in check as they advanced on Butterfield's lines. When darkness came on, our artillery firing ceased and about midnight Butterfield's Brigade straggled across the Chickahominy and joined Smith's command. General Smith immediately ordered Butterfield's Brigade in his line of works and issued rations to them on the condition that they would stay there. About daylight, General Smith received a telegram from General Butterfield, who was at Trent House, General McClellan's headquarters—four miles south of our front. The telegram read:

General Smith. Where is my Brigade?

To which Smith replied:

Come and see.

A few hours later, the movement known as the "McClellan change of base" was in motion. The divisions of Generals Franklin and Smith acted as a rear guard. At that time most of Lee's Army was on the north side of the Chickahominy and it was supposed that only a small force was between Richmond and our rear guard. I overheard General Franklin say to General Smith: "'Baldy,' call in your pickets and fall back on Savage Station." To this General Smith replied: "Frank, give me the order and I will put my command in Richmond before they shall have a mouthful to eat." General Franklin answered: "I believe you could do it, but our orders are to fall back."

It fell to my lot to call in the pickets and follow the Army to Savage Station. In the retreat I discovered an abandoned Whitworth Gun, which I afterwards learned belonged to the First Connecticut Heavy Artillery. With some of the picket men, we tried to haul the gun out of the ravine in which it was abandoned, but were soon obliged to leave it, because of the lively fire of the Confederate sharpshooters. I overtook General Franklin on the road to Savage Station and reported the facts regarding this abandoned gun. General Franklin immediately ordered me to take a team of horses, with cannoniers from the first field battery I could reach, and added that he relied upon me personally to "recover that gun at all hazards."

Fortunately, there was a spur of woods through which we could reach the gun without being much exposed to the enemy. Dismounting, we crept up on our hands and knees to the gun. To my surprise I found that it was equipped with a pole and chains for a mule team, and this equipment would not suit the harness of the artillery horses which we had brought for the recovery. The occasion was an exciting one and we fell back a short distance. The Confederate sharpshooters had located our rescuing party and we decided that there was no time to be lost. The whole party, sergeant and cannoniers, dashed into the ravine again, stretched the trail rope, wound it around the pole, and tied the whiffletrees and pole chains of the mule outfit to the traces of the battery team. With a hurrah, we galloped out of the ravine under a heavy volley from the Confederate sharpshooters. Three of the Battery team and a corporal were wounded, but the gun was turned over to General Franklin, who thanked us all for our success.

Even at this late day, over fifty years later, I recall my nervousness as I rode across the open field at a gallop for that gun. In the distance I could see a line of rebel skirmishers coming forward at the double quick. I realized that, being mounted, my little command had the advantage, although some invisible sharpshooters held us in check at times and, on our retreat, quickened our movements. I remember mentally questioning myself as to the value of the gun and whether it was worth the risk. I braced up, however, by repeating to myself the order of General Franklin: "Recover that gun at all hazards"—at all hazards! I now believe I

would have abandoned the gun when I found that the breech piece was missing were it not for the General's explicit orders ringing in my ears: "Recover that gun at all hazards."

At Westover, on the James River, an officer of the First Connecticut came to our headquarters to thank me for saving the gun and promised that he would send the staff a case of champagne. It is needless to add that the case never arrived!

The Retreat from Malvern Hill

THE day following the Battle of White Oak Swamp, the Army of the Potomac fought the Battle of Malvern Hill.

At about midnight the night after the battle General Fitz-John Porter's command withdrew and took up the line of march for Harrison's Landing, eight miles further down the James River. Upon learning that Porter's division was on the move, the other division commanders, despite the absence of any orders, gave the word to follow and in all of my three and a half years of Army experience I never saw anything that equaled the demoralization and recklessness of our soldiers in the retreat from Malvern Hill.

There was but one road available for all of these divisions and many of the marching columns were forced to take to the open fields. These, because of a drenching rain, were fields of mud and soon all semblance to marching order was lost and the "change of base" resembled a surging mob, without regimental organization. I saw many men break the stocks off their muskets and toss them in the ditches.

At the carriage entrance to Westover House (Harrison's Landing) there was a large oak tree. General Smith's staff officers got together there and by crying out "Smith's division rally on that big tree," these cries resulted in the assembling of at least ninety per cent of the division and before sundown the division was reorganized and in good shape for any emergency.

During the afternoon I was ordered to find General McClellan's headquarters. Just in front of Westover House, I found one of General McClellan's staff officers. Upon my asking for the General's headquarters, he replied, "This is Headquarters and I am the only representative." I knew the officer intimately and he showed me a note which had been brought to him by an orderly. The note was addressed to "General McClellan's Headquarters," and read as follows:

GENERAL McCLELLAN:

Generals Marcy, Van Vliet and I are on board the Gunboat "Galena," your army is totally routed, you had best come aboard.

ANDREW PORTER,
Brigadier-General and Provost Marshal.

It is a well-known fact that General McClellan did board a gunboat and the reason given for his doing so was that he might make a reconnaissance and ascertain what the enemy were doing at Malvern Hill and beyond.

History now tells us that the enemy were retreating from Malvern Hill in the direction of Richmond, while the Army of the Potomac was retreating at the same time in the direction of West-over. It has been claimed and justly, I think, that if McClellan had followed up his victory at Malvern Hill, he could have entered Richmond without much difficulty.

The following morning, at daybreak, a section of Confederate artillery opened fire on the demoralized and disorganized Army of the Potomac. It was a mixed mass of infantry, artillery and a small remnant of the cavalry of that Army. On the report of the first gun, hundreds of men ran to the banks of the James River for shelter. Fortunately, the Vermont brigade, of Smith's division, under command of General W. T. H. Brooks, having been well re-organized the previous afternoon, were deployed as skirmishers and quickly drove the rebel battery out of sight.

I was sent to General McClellan's headquarters for orders and, while there, overheard the following conversation between General McClellan and General Reno. General Reno said to General McClellan, "I did suppose there was someone in command of this Army who would know enough to order pickets posted, so as to prevent the enemy driving into our midst and opening an artillery fire before its advance was discovered." And General McClellan replied: "Reno, we are in a bad fix but with a little patience and prompt action things will improve."

General Reno was evidently very much disturbed and indignant at the condition of affairs. He was a gallant soldier and was killed at the Battle of South Mountain, Maryland, the following September.

The Rally of the Vermont Brigade

THE so-called "Battle of White Oak Swamp" on June 30, 1862, was not a battle in any sense; it was rather what might be termed a rear guard fight. Its principal feature was the terrific artillery firing of General Stonewall Jackson's command.

General "Baldy" Smith's division, having been engaged in the fight at Savage Station the day before, crossed White Oak Swamp during the night, destroying the bridges as they proceeded. The division bivouacked that night on the hillside south of the Swamp.

General Jackson's artillery was secretly massed in the woods on the crest of the hill, on the opposite side of the swamp, about one thousand yards away. At about 2.00 P.M. the next day the enemy opened an artillery fire and the attack was so sudden and severe that our troops were stampeded. They rallied, however, in the woods on the crest of the hill, in the rear.

The Vermont Brigade, at that time consisting of four regiments and numbering about twenty-five hundred men, was on the left of our line and was there exposed to an enfilading fire of the enemy's batteries. It so happened I had been ordered by General Smith to see that the Vermont Brigade should take a position behind the crest of the hill and, consequently, I was the *only mounted officer* on that part of the field when the enemy opened fire. There was at the moment much confusion and I realized that something must be done immediately or the confusion would be apparent to the enemy. At once I saw the necessity of rallying the Vermont Brigade. I found the four regimental color-bearers in a group, well to the front and they asked me for orders. I told them to uncover their colors immediately and to take positions one hundred yards apart; then, riding in among the men, I ordered them to rally on the colors. There was some hesitation, as the men did not recognize their individual regimental colors. Perceiving this hesitation I shouted repeatedly, "You belong to the State of Vermont, fall in

with the colors nearest to you and advance!" In a few minutes there were at least thirteen hundred men in line and, on my order, they went forward at the double quick, in open order, firing at will. Very shortly after this advance, Jackson's artillery ceased firing and it was evident that by our prompt advance the enemy had been made to believe we were in strong force on his front and flank. The movement, judging from General Jackson's own report, served to check the infantry attack which Jackson had prepared to make after his terrific artillery fire.

General Jackson's report to Headquarters (No. 232) reads as follows:

About noon we reached White Oak Swamp and here the enemy made a determined effort to retard our advance and thereby to prevent an immediate junction between General Longstreet and myself. We found the bridge destroyed and the ordinary place of crossing commanded by sharpshooters. A battery of 28 guns from Hills and Whittings' artillery was placed by Col. S. Crutchfield in a favorable position for driving off or silencing the opposing artillery. About 2 P.M. it opened suddenly on the enemy. He fired a few shots in reply and then withdrew from that position abandoning part of his artillery. Capt. Wooding was immediately ordered near the bridge to shell the sharpshooters from the woods, which was accomplished, and Mumford's cavalry crossed the creek, but was soon compelled to retire. It was soon seen that the enemy occupied such a position beyond a thick intervening woods on the right of the road as enabled him to command the crossing. Capt. Wooding's battery was consequently recalled and our batteries turned in the new direction. The fire so opened on both sides was kept up until dark. We bivouacked that night near the swamp.

The illustration on the opposite page is a recent photograph of a painting by Julian Scott, "the boy artist of the Army of the Potomac." The painting, entitled "The Rally of the Vermont Brigade," is the property of the Union League Club of New York and was photographed by their kind permission. It is said that no man sees himself as others see him, but as the artist assured me that the mounted figure on the left was none other than myself, I assume that I must bow to his portrayal.

Forty-seven years have elapsed since Julian Scott finished the picture, and pictures, like individuals, fade with the lapse of time. The dramatic scene, despite its seeming "imperfections," is pub-



THE RALLY OF THE VERMONT BRIGADE

At the Battle of White Oak Swamp

Captain Strymer may be seen at extreme left, mounted. Photograph from a painting by
Julian Scott, owned by the Union League Club, New York

lished because Scott himself assured me that it was intended as a portrayal of the "Rally of the Vermont Brigade," which I have endeavored to describe.

My object in telling the story is to give credit to the gallant Green Mountain boys. I do not, of course, claim that Stonewall Jackson's command was checked solely through my instrumentality. The incident, however, reminds me of a story which I heard in my boyhood regarding the evacuation of the City of New York by the British forces, and their fleet, in the Revolution. A New Jersey farmer living at Fort Lee, on the banks of the Hudson, hearing that the British were leaving, mounted his horse and galloped to Bergen Point, from whence he saw the last British ship passing out of the Narrows. Turning to a bystander he exclaimed: "I do not claim that the British were leaving because I was coming, but it looks very much like it."

The Ending of the Battle of Antietam

IN one of his Civil War articles, Mr. G. W. Smalley evinces a desire to learn the time and place when General McClellan definitely decided to discontinue his attacks on General Lee's line.

At the time of the Battle of Antietam, I was an Aide-de-camp on the staff of General "Baldy" Smith, whose division was on the march at the head of General Franklin's command. This command, on the morning of September 17, 1862, marched hurriedly from Crampton's Gap, across country, to the line of battle on the west side of Mumma's Woods—parallel with the Hagerstown turnpike and about 150 yards east of that turnpike, directly in front of the Dunker Church.

Generals Smith and Hancock, with their staffs, were considerably in advance of their troops.

As we approached the front we found about twelve pieces of our artillery in a useless condition, on the west border of the woods. Lieutenant Rufus King, of the Fourth United States Artillery, was the only artillery officer in sight and he reported that many of the men and horses belonging to these batteries had been killed and disabled and that they of the artillery were without infantry support.

At this critical moment, General Hancock rode out on the cornfield, in front of the batteries, and shouted that the enemy was advancing.

General Smith immediately ordered the 20th New York Infantry to advance in line through the cornfield at the double quick. In its charge, of about one hundred yards, this regiment lost 20 per cent in killed and wounded. It drove the enemy back, however. After the charge, the 20th was ordered to lie down behind the crest of a slight rise. The prompt advance of the 20th New York undoubtedly checked the enemy's advance and saved our artillery.

As nearly as I can remember now, this movement took place at about eleven o'clock in the forenoon. Shortly after that time General McClellan arrived on the field and joined Generals Frank-

lin, Smith, Sumner, Slocum and others. There was a hasty conference in the cornfield as to what had taken place and the advisability of continuing the attack on the enemy's lines, in the neighborhood of Dunker Church. General Franklin advised that Burnside's attack on the enemy's right should be pushed with vigor and that there should be simultaneous attacks on the enemy's extreme left, and at Dunker Church.

While this conference was taking place, the Confederates pushed a piece of artillery, by hand, to the crest of the hill, on the Sharpsburg road, a little south of Dunker Church. When in position, the gun was fired at the group of officers, some twenty or more, then in consultation. Fortunately for the Union cause, the range was too high and the charge of cannister, although fired within 150 yards of the group, passed harmlessly over the Union generals. I have often thought that the firing of this gun, at this critical moment, was an important factor in determining that there should be no further attack on the enemy's line.

General McClellan quickly called upon General Sumner for his opinion as to the situation. General Sumner's reputation was that of a fighter and I believe that he, when he then advised that the fighting should cease, did so for the first time in his career. General Sumner's whole command had been engaged and was badly cut up and unfit for service.

General McClellan then turned to General Franklin, saying, "Frank, hold on to all you have, reinforce General Sumner's line and make no further advance, acting solely on the defensive until further orders." McClellan then ordered Sumner to withdraw his line and to reorganize his command. Although General Sumner had with him a half-dozen staff officers, he turned to his son, saying: "Sammy, my boy, ride out to the skirmish line and order it and the division to fall back at once."

It was a sight that I shall never forget. In the most touching manner, "Sammy," who was an Aide-de-camp on his father's staff, and then only about eighteen years old, raised his cap and said, "Goodby, father," and the General answered, "Goodby, my boy."

Thus ended the last attack on the enemy's lines in front of Dunker Church, on September 17, 1862.

"Sammy, my boy" is now Brigadier-General Samuel Sumner, U. S. A. (retired).

The Reading of the Emancipation Proclamation


I WELL recall the night preceding the reading of President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation to the Army.

At midnight on the 22nd of September, 1862, I was called to escort General William F. Smith to a conference at General McClellan's headquarters. The conference was an important one and only division commanders were admitted. With other Aides, I remained outside but subsequently learned from General Smith what had taken place.

General Smith told me that all of the division commanders were present when the meeting was called to order by General McClellan. The scene must have been a dramatic one. General McClellan opened the proceedings by stating that he had received from the President of the United States a proclamation of conditional emancipation, which, in brief, called upon the enemy to surrender on or before January 1, 1863, and warned it that failure to do so would result in the emancipation of all slaves. General McClellan stated that the proclamation was accompanied by an order to have the same read to the entire Army the day following its receipt.

General McClellan then read a proposed form of protest, which he had prepared and, after reading, asked that it be signed by all present, if approved. The protest was addressed to the President of the United States and it was to the effect that the reading of the proclamation to the Army would have a most demoralizing effect and that the Army of the Potomac could not be expected to win battles if officially informed that it was fighting for the emancipation of slaves.

Two of the Generals immediately approved of General McClellan's formal protest and it then came General Smith's turn to speak. General Smith, in no uncertain words, strongly objected to the protest and advised, with vehemence, that the orders of the President of the United States should be obeyed, closing with the



Reproduced by the kind
permission of the
publishers,
Professional Memoirs

Wm. H. Smith
Maj. Genl.
Comd'g 9th Corps

brief but effective statement that his command would fight whenever and wherever ordered, and that the only *demoralization* of which he was cognizant was in that tent.

The scene, as I have said, must have been a dramatic one. After the remarks of General Smith the conference broke up. It is sufficient to state that the proclamation of conditional emancipation was read the following day to the Army, at dress parade, as ordered by President Lincoln.

The Army of the Potomac "Not Demoralized"

ON May 30, 1909, there appeared an article in *The New York Tribune*, entitled "A Chapter of Unwritten History," by George W. Smalley.

In this article, Mr. Smalley states that, after the Battle of Chancellorsville, in May, 1863, he was sent by the managing editor of *The Tribune* on a mission of inquiry to the Army of the Potomac, the mission being to ascertain who the Army of the Potomac wanted for a leader.

I have nothing to say in regard to that feature of his mission but I do feel that I should combat Mr. Smalley's oft-repeated statement that the Army of the Potomac was, *at the time of his mission*, "demoralized." Mr. Smalley says, in his article, that he was obliged to report to Mr. Gay, managing editor of *The Tribune*, "that the demoralization was complete" and, he adds, "such interest as the matter has is now historical, and so for the first time I make public a part, and only a part, of what I learned in that month of May, 1863."

To my mind, it is better, in writing history, that mistakes without foundation should not creep in, particularly after a lapse of "forty-odd years," and it is better still that such mistakes should not be "copyrighted."

I take exception to the statement that the Army of the Potomac was "demoralized" at that time. The Army itself was not demoralized; if there was any demoralization it was "higher up."

In support of my contention, it is simply necessary to call to mind the fact that, within a few weeks after Mr. Smalley's report of demoralization, the Army of the Potomac fought and won the Battle of Gettysburg. The fighting and the winning of the Battle of Gettysburg would seem to disprove the claim "that the soul had gone out of it" (The Army of the Potomac) and "that its demoralization was complete."

General "Ben" Butler

IN the Spring of 1864, General Butler's command, consisting of Smith's and Gilmore's divisions, sailed from Old Point Comfort to Bermuda Hundreds, between Richmond and Petersburg, on the James River, the two divisions comprising about eighteen thousand men. Their landing was a great surprise, so much so that our skirmishers were enabled to capture a telegraph office on the Apomattox River. The operator of that office had left in such haste that he, apparently, quite forgot his ten-year-old boy, who was found in charge of the telegraph office. It looked at the time as if the boy had been left there intentionally, for he had a most alarming story to tell us, to the effect that General Lee had "wiped out" Grant in the Wilderness and was then marching rapidly to overtake Butler's command and capture it. General Butler listened to the boy's story and, taking him by the ear, cross-examined him behind a clump of bushes. After the "third degree" was completed the General returned, still holding the boy by the ear. Turning to the officers near-by General Butler said, "Gentlemen, this boy is a liar—there is not a word of truth in what he says about Lee's victory over Grant, so don't be alarmed."

Hearing this, the little boy shook himself free and exclaimed with a voice filled with indignation, "You call me a liar? I know who you are! You are 'Beast Butler' and when I get old enough I'll lick you. You stole my grandmother's spoons." Such an exhibition of pluck was surprising, considering the attack was on General Butler, who had eighteen thousand soldiers behind him.

Mr. Choate's "Argument" in the General Fitz-John Porter Re-Hearing

SPEAKING of General Fitz-John Porter, I was visiting in the neighborhood of West Point, at the time of the re-hearing of the trial in which Porter had been dismissed from the service. Knowing General Porter as I did, I, of course, attended the re-hearing.

The Court was composed of General Tyler, General Getty and General Schofield.

The Government was represented by Colonel Asa Bird Gardiner, U. S. A., then Adjutant-General. General Porter was represented by Messrs. Choate and Bullitt. Colonel Gardiner addressed the Court something over forty-eight hours in all. The thermometer was in the nineties, yet Colonel Gardiner appeared in full war paint, cocked hat, epaulets and spurs. Colonel Gardiner's address dealt mainly with Army Regulations and these, of course, the veteran officers of the Court knew better than their prayers.

At the conclusion of Colonel Gardiner's address, Mr. Choate arose and in his inimitable way opened his brief address to the Court, in the following manner:

We have listened with patience to the remarks of the distinguished Adjutant-General of the United States Army. His long argument reminds me of the advice once given to the graduating class of the Theological Seminary of Tennessee, which was:

"Now, boys, remember one thing, do not make long prayers, always remember that the Lord does know something."

It is needless to say that the Court reinstated General Fitz-John Porter.

The "Great Conspiracy"

A NUMBER of years after the close of the war, I happened to meet General Fitz-John Porter at the Catskill Mountain House, where we were both staying. It proved to be a most interesting renewal of our former Army acquaintance.

After many delightful reminiscences, General Porter informed me, in a most confidential manner, that he had something to tell me, and I judged that the information was of a decidedly secret nature as the General insisted that I climb with him to a certain isolated spot on the side of the mountain before he would divulge the story.

Upon reaching the spot, General Porter told me his secret in the following startling words: "Captain Scrymser, on Monday next, the great conspiracy is to be exposed!" I endeavored to appear grateful for the information but, being ignorant of the "Great Conspiracy" and its alarming exposure, was forced to ask what conspiracy he had reference to?

General Porter replied, "Why, the conspiracy of Lincoln and Stanton, by which they seized the Government of the United States. All of the facts are to be made public."

I, apparently impressed, asked General Porter in what form this great exposure was to be made?

"In 'McClellan's Own Story,' which is to be published next Monday, containing the life and letters of General George B. McClellan and many historical facts by Dr. W. C. Prime, by whom the book is edited."

"And this," I said, "will expose the 'great conspiracy'—against McClellan and the Government?"

"Yes," he replied.

I fear the General thought me lacking in appreciation of his confidence. I merely said, "General, the public have handed in their verdict long ago and you may rest assured that the 'great conspiracy,' to which you refer, will receive no attention whatsoever."

Such proved to be the case.

Citizenry-Trained Soldiers

IN an article on "Wireless Telegraphy," I have quoted from President Wilson's message to Congress of December 8, 1914, and his statement that "We shall learn and profit by the lesson of every experience and every new circumstance." A further paragraph in the President's message is worthy of comment, *viz.:*

Let us remind ourselves, therefore, of the only thing we can do or will do. We must depend in every time of national peril, in the future as in *the past*, not upon a standing Army, nor yet upon a reserve Army, but upon a *citizenry trained and accustomed to arms*.

The italics are my own.

Can it be possible that such an eminent historian as President Wilson is unaware of the facts in regard to our "citizen army" of 1861? How that Army, some thirty-four thousand strong, after a drilling of two or three months, was panic-stricken at the Battle of Bull Run and how it never stopped running some thirty-seven miles in record time until it reached the fortifications on the outskirts of Washington, stampeded, as it was in the beginning of the panic, by the Confederate Black Horse Cavalry, numbering less than two hundred and fifty men.

Mayor Hewitt in England

WHILE on a coaching trip in Derbyshire, England, our party stopped one day to see the celebrated country seat of Lord Vernon, at Sudbury. When told whose estate it was, I was reminded of a story which Mr. Hewitt told me about Lord Vernon. It seems that Mayor Hewitt was visiting "my lord" and that, in honor of his distinguished guest, Lord Vernon had invited the gentry of the neighborhood to a banquet to meet our city's mayor. During the dinner, Lord Vernon said, "Now, Mr. Hewitt, a man of your wide experience, cultivation and travel would certainly have a happier life in England than in America, don't you think so?" Mr. Hewitt, who was a man of wonderful versatility and most engaging conversational powers replied, "Your Lordship may recall the fact that there is a little jog of about ten acres on the northern boundary of your estate. I have been examining the County map and records and I find that that ten acres was once owned by my grandfather. Now you ask me if I would not find a home in England more congenial than one in America? My answer, my Lord, is that I presume that this is the first time a Hewitt ever had the honor of being invited to your lordship's table."

“English as She is Spoke”

DURING the coaching trip in England, alluded to in the previous story, one of the four horses fell, because of the excessive heat. I at once went to a neighboring farmhouse and asked an English woman in charge if she would kindly let me have a pail of water.

“A pail, is it?” she said.

“Yes, a pail,” I replied.

“We have no pail,” she answered.

When I went to the well she discovered my predicament and screamed, “Oh, a bucket is it, you want?” and this was quickly furnished.

Upon our return to London, we were dining with some English friends and the incident was mentioned. All of the English people at the table loyally stood by their countrywoman and claimed that the woman was perfectly right, that there was no such thing as a pail in England.

Mrs. Scrymser mildly asked whether the Mother Goose Stories were not of English origin? Our good English friends all replied in the affirmative, and then Mrs. Scrymser asked how they accounted for the fact that “Jack and Jill went up the hill to fetch a pail of water?”

Hon. Roscoe Conkling

ON an ocean voyage I once had as fellow passengers the Hon. Abram S. Hewitt and the Hon. Roscoe Conkling. Senator Conkling was a man of striking appearance and rather given to a just appreciation of himself. We three were walking the deck when Mr. Hewitt turned to me and said, "Scrymser, how tall are you?" I replied, "Something over six feet." And, "Mr. Senator," said Mr. Hewitt, turning to Conkling, "how tall are you?" To which query the Senator replied in his own majestic way, "I do not know, sir." Mr. Hewitt, with a twinkle in his eye, turned to me and said, "Scrymser, that is good, Roscoe doesn't know what a big man he is," whereupon, Conkling raised his hat, and said, "Mr. Mayor, I owe you one."

Public Schools in England

I LIVED in London in 1872 and 1873, when Mr. Gladstone was Prime Minister.

I have never heard a public official more severely denounced and criticized than was Mr. Gladstone, both because of his extension of the franchise and his work in behalf of the extension of the school system.

I remember that on one occasion I was on a coaching trip, my host being a titled English gentleman. In crossing Chelsea Bridge, a small boy ran in front of the coach and the wheels crushed the boy's felt hat, which had been knocked off. I remarked to my host that running over the hat could have been avoided and was astounded when he replied, "Damn him, I wish his head had been in it." Mention is made of this incident to show the feeling at that time the aristocracy held towards the lower classes.

There was not one man in ten in the agricultural districts of England who could read or write. I ascertained this fact on another coaching trip of 1100 miles through the most attractive part of England, in the summer of 1884. The illiteracy everywhere was deplorable. At the time, I was endeavoring to establish in London what is known in New York as the American District Telegraph Service, and it was absolutely impossible to secure a sufficient number of intelligent boys to start a single office in London.

Discharged, rheumatic soldiers were the only messengers available and very few of that kind could be had.

Twenty years later some friends went to London for the purpose of organizing a company on the lines of the American District Telegraph. The first week they had applications from over six thousand intelligent, capable boys, an eloquent testimony of the value of Mr. Gladstone's School Bill of 1872 and 1873.

The growth of intelligence had been so complete that the English people failed to realize the splendid results of Mr. Glad-

stone's policy, and I found that it required some definite statement like the foregoing to prove to them that Mr. Gladstone's liberal policies, of extension of the suffrage and the establishment of schools, had achieved such remarkable results. These measures probably saved England from a revolution.

Interview with Baron De Rothschild

I HAD a most interesting experience in Paris in the winter of 1872, the month of January.

It was my purpose to lay before the French Government a Telegraph enterprise in which Messrs. August Belmont, Levi P. Morton, J. Pierpont Morgan and other prominent bankers were interested.

I was the bearer of a letter of introduction from Mr. Belmont to Baron Alphonse De Rothschild, the principal representative of the Rothschild house in Paris.

Upon my arrival in Paris, I consulted some of my influential friends as to when I should present the letter introducing me to the Baron, and I remarked that I expected to get an introduction from Baron De Rothschild to M. Leon Sey, then Minister of the Interior. My friends all laughed at my hopes and were unanimous in their opinion that I would not be successful, each one informing me that it was a well-known fact that the House of Rothschild never gave letters of introduction to any one.

I was sanguine of success, however,—so sanguine that I made a bet of a dinner for six with Walter Burns, J. Pierpont Morgan's brother-in-law, that I would obtain such a letter of introduction, notwithstanding my total lack of experience in such matters.

As a beginning, I enclosed my letter of introduction to the Baron with a polite note, asking for the honor of an interview at such a time as it would be convenient for him to see me. In due course, I received a note from the Baron's secretary, appointing a time for the interview—at the De Rothschild banking house in the Rue Taitvout, 19. (Although it is over forty years ago, I remember the number well.) At the appointed hour I went up the stairway of the banking house with a good deal of nervousness and trepidation. At the head of the stairway I was met by Baron De Rothschild's private secretary, who courteously explained to me that because of an unexpected engagement the Baron would not

be able to receive me until the following day. I have often thought that this postponement was proposed merely to give his secretary an opportunity to size me up and to determine whether the meeting would be agreeable to the Baron. Next day, at the hour named, I again mounted the stairway with fear and trembling and was immediately passed into the banking room and there met the famous Baron De Rothschild. The Baron received me in a most charming and friendly manner and his reception put me at my ease at once.

He offered me a cigarette and suggested that we should pull our chairs before the open fire and take up "that business." Fortunately, I had a Loyal Legion button in the lapel of my coat which attracted the Baron's attention and required a lengthy explanation from me as to what the button was, and a detailed account of my experiences in the Civil War. This broke the ice. The Baron was particularly anxious to secure from me any information which I could give him as to the military career of the Comte de Paris, and the Duke de Chartres, both of whom, it will be remembered, accompanied their uncle, Prince de Joinville, during our Civil War, all three serving on the staff of General McClellan, in 1861 and 1862.

It so happened that I had seen much of these gallant gentlemen during that time, while an Aide-de-Camp on the staff of General "Baldy" Smith. General Smith's headquarters were, while at the front, five miles west of Chain Bridge and about twelve miles from Washington. General Smith would often organize foraging expeditions into the enemy's country, more for practice than forage, and whenever there was a likelihood of a skirmish, the General would invite the French Princes to join us. I well remember on one occasion, with three separate companies of cavalry, we made a raid on a Confederate picket reserve on Flint Hill near Fairfax Court House. We left headquarters at two o'clock in the morning and before daylight made a dash on the house occupied by the Confederate pickets. I had command of a company of cavalry and was accompanied by the Comte de Paris. We dismounted a short distance from the house and at a given signal made a dash and, by closing in well up to the house, with a few sharpshooters about one hundred paces away, the Confederate

inmates could not shoot from the windows above without being picked off by our sharpshooters. On our demand, the Confederates dropped their rifles from the second story windows and came down unarmed and surrendered, but not until an Irish Corporal, who becoming tired of waiting, broke in the front door with a big stone. Our little attack resulted in the capture of twenty-two Confederate soldiers, all armed with Colt's revolving rifles.

Baron De Rothschild was intensely interested in all that I could tell him about the French Princes, and particularly in regard to their behavior at the Battle of Williamsburg, the day on which Yorktown was evacuated. On this occasion the Compté de Paris was with us all day and displayed his usual gallantry, even remarking to me that he would like very much to be wounded. There was a drenching rain that night and I arranged to have the Compté bivouac with me. I built a "lean-to" of rails against a rail fence and made a comfortable bed of corn shocks and there we slept together, under the same blanket, within one hundred yards of the picket line. Instances of this sort so interested the Baron that he never referred to "that business," and it took me no less than three afternoons in succession to tell him all that I knew about the French Princes.

I was, naturally, very anxious to discuss business with the Baron, but I realized that it would not be politic to force the subject until the Baron himself introduced it. My hotel bill was running up at the rate of six dollars per day, and I began to feel doubtful in regard to that dinner, that is, who should pay for it. Finally, at the close of a long afternoon's talk, the Baron suddenly exclaimed, "Oh, Sir, I owe you an apology, I forgot all about that business. As you go downstairs you ask my secretary for that letter of introduction to M. Leon Sey."

It is needless to note that we had our dinner and that I did not pay for it! At the dinner it was announced that this was the first instance a De Rothschild letter of introduction was ever known in Paris.

The Minister of the Interior

IN due course I received notice of an appointment with the Minister of the Interior, M. Leon Sey. When the time for the interview came I found that His Excellency had learned about me from the Baron De Rothschild, and the instant my card was presented the doors were thrown open to me and I was received after the manner of a royal visitor.

The interview resulted in the authorization of a Concession for the installation of a news printing service which was to be issued to parties whom I represented, subject to such regulations as the authorities deemed necessary. I retained an expert lawyer who drew up what I considered to be a brief and proper form of concession. This I submitted to Minister Leon Sey who informed me it that would have to take the regular course through the departments for the consideration of each. After five long months of patient waiting, I was officially informed that the Concession, with amendments, was subject to my acceptance. Imagine my astonishment when I found that the Concession contained a requirement by the Chief of the Paris Police, that "La Machines" should be installed in metallic cases and the keys to those cases should be kept in the pockets of a "functionary" whose duty it would be to examine the printed tapes daily to see that nothing immoral or detrimental to the public good was printed! It was further stipulated that "La Machine" was not to work until the "functionary" had issued a certificate certifying to the fact that nothing detrimental to the public good had appeared on the printed tape the previous day.

The Bishop of Paris approved of the requirements of the Chief of Police and added that he disapproved of the project itself, as he thought it would lead to speculation and consequent danger to the morals of the banking fraternity of Paris!

The impossibility of operating a news printing service on these conditions will be apparent, and the trouble was further intensified,

a few days later, by a change of the entire government and a consequent ousting of the Minister of the Interior, all of which necessitated going over the whole scheme again and, in consequence, it was abandoned.

In many such negotiations with foreign countries much time is lost by changes in government; such was the case in Japan where, after several long interviews with the then Prime Minister Count Okuma, a contract was concluded and, to my dismay, the following day there was a change of government and the whole scheme was killed.

It was a common saying among my friends in Paris, that there would be a change of government within forty-eight hours of my arrival there.

A Hired Coach and Livery in the City of Mexico

DURING my first visit to the City of Mexico, in the winter of 1880, the Paseo, between the City of Mexico and the Castle of Chapultepec, was a gay scene in the mornings. Here the Mexicans of the wealthier class could be seen taking their morning ride on beautiful, prancing horses. The riders were dressed in black velvet, their trousers striped with silver buttons. Elaborate silver spurs dangled at their heels and on their heads were broad sombreros with silver embroidery and cords. Each rider was mounted on an elaborately silver embroidered saddle, and attached to the saddle, hanging over the horse's back, was a tiger skin. The scene was certainly an animated one. There would be fifty or more riders so equipped and these riders, with horses champing at their silver bits, presented a fascinating sight.

There was but one coach or carriage at that time for hire in the City of Mexico. It was of the type used for funerals in this country, and belonged to a cobbler. The cobbler's charge for his coach, and a fairly good team of horses and driver, was one dollar silver per hour. The coachman was attired in a jacket, somewhat ragged at the elbows, but mounted, nevertheless, with silver buttons, and so short that there was an interval of about six inches of shirt between jacket and trousers. I found it necessary on a certain day to hire this coach, as Mrs. Scrymser had several visits to make. Inasmuch as these visits were of a ceremonial nature, I urged the proprietor to equip his driver with a proper livery for the occasion. At the appointed hour my chartered coach appeared at the hotel. Imagine our surprise when we found that it had been followed by a large crowd, which patiently waited to see who was to occupy the vehicle. From our hotel window we observed two men on the box. We took in the "livery" at a glance. The driver and the groom were both barefooted but, otherwise, were undoubtedly arrayed for the occasion. On their heads were the famous Mexican sombreros, and they were clothed in gorgeous claret-

colored liveries, adorned with a liberal amount of gold braid on sleeves and collars. We made our departure, the crowd at the hotel staring at us in awe-struck silence.

That evening we visited the circus and not until then did I realize the reason for the crowd at the hotel, so intent upon seeing who were to be the occupants of the coach. The proprietor of the coach had, it seems, in an effort to please me, hired from the circus the liveries worn by the ringmasters' grooms. These gorgeous outfits were naturally known to all the boys in Mexico, who evidently mistook my wife and self for newly arrived bareback circus riders on the way to the circus. This experience taught me the lesson to take what you can get and to try no experiment in a foreign country.

Namesakes

WHEN Mr. Frank Thomson, President of the Pennsylvania Railroad, heard that Mr. Morgan was planning a trip to Washington, for an interview with President Cleveland, he straightway offered Mr. Morgan the use of his private car and his celebrated colored cook. The courtesy was accepted and Mr. Morgan asked two of his friends to accompany him. I was one of the number.

When we entered the car, we found an open fire and every appearance of comfort, all of which proved most attractive, especially so to Mr. Morgan, who was tired and hungry. Mr. Morgan astonished us by disclosing the fact that he had had nothing to eat or drink in the past twenty-four hours, with the exception of a half cup of coffee. He explained that "this morning" a party of Wall Street men had called him from the breakfast table and that, until now, he had had no time to either eat or drink!

A capital dinner was quickly served and our host was much refreshed. After dinner, for the entertainment of Mr. Bacon and myself, Mr. Morgan read some begging letters which he had hastily put in his pocket on leaving his office. They were all in the same vein but I recall one in particular, from a clergyman in Oregon. The letter was addressed to "Hon. John Pierpont Morgan," and read somewhat as follows:

Last week my wife gave birth to three boys and I have named them John, Pierpont and Morgan. Can you help me in this unexpected responsibility?

It was remarked that if Mr. Morgan had had another name there certainly would have been another boy.


J. P. Morgan and President Cleveland's Anti-Bond Issue

J. PIERPONT MORGAN'S action in what is known as the "Cleveland Anti-Bond Issue" is certainly worth recording. It will be remembered that during Mr. Cleveland's second administration the gold reserve in the United States Treasury had fallen to \$40,000,000, and that gold was going out of the Treasury at the rate of \$2,000,000 a day. President Cleveland and the Senate had come to a deadlock and there was every prospect of the financial system of the United States being changed to a Silver basis.

At this crisis, I was invited by Mr. Morgan to accompany him to Washington, as described in the previous article. Mr. Morgan told me that President Cleveland had both written and telegraphed to him that he would refuse to see him upon financial matters should he come to Washington. Mr. Morgan was not deterred, however, and determined to go to Washington, inspired, as he was, with the highest patriotic motives.

Upon his arrival at Washington Mr. Morgan went to the White House and was there received by the President. A few hours later, Mr. Morgan described his interview to me. When Mr. Morgan was announced, the President stalked forth from his private office, as Mr. Morgan described it, with both hands thrust into his trousers pockets, apparently disinclined to greet Mr. Morgan in a friendly spirit.

The President's first remark was: "Mr. Morgan, I have written and telegraphed to you that I would not see you in reference to any Government financial matters. The Senate has placed me in a false position before the country and I am determined that the people shall know that the Senate is to blame." To this statement Mr. Morgan replied to the effect that the country was on the verge of the greatest financial panic that the



Leopoldo

world had ever witnessed and that unless the outflow of gold was checked the credit of the Government would be destroyed.

At this point, Richard Olney, then Attorney-General, entered the room and Mr. Morgan reminded him of the fact that in 1861 the United States Government had authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to buy gold to meet its gold interest and Mr. Morgan asked Mr. Olney whether that Act was still in force. Mr. Olney declared that it was, whereupon Mr. Morgan turned to the President and said: "Mr. President, I do not ask you to sell bonds but I propose to sell you \$100,000,000 in gold." At this, Mr. Cleveland's manner immediately changed and, within half an hour, a contract had been drawn up whereby the United States Treasury obtained \$60,000,000 in gold through a syndicate formed by Mr. Morgan.

I repeat, Mr. Morgan's action at this time is well worth recording. His sterling patriotism has been evidenced many times.

A Dinner in Honor of General Scott and Admiral Farragut


ONE afternoon at the Atheneum Club, shortly after the close of the war in 1865, William T. Blodgett, then President of the Club, told a number of us younger members of a dinner which he was to give at his house, in honor of General Scott and Admiral Farragut, one, the first Lieutenant-General of the United States Army and the other, the first Admiral of the United States Navy. Mr. Blodgett gave us all a very cordial invitation to "drop in" after dinner and play whist with his distinguished guests.

Mr. Blodgett's house was on 25th Street, near Broadway and adjoined Trinity Chapel. Mr. Blodgett spared no trouble to make the dinner a memorable one. In the alcove in the dining room, there was placed Church's beautiful picture of the "Heart of the Andes" and in front of the picture was a bank of palms. I was told that when the dinner was about finished the lights were turned down and a curtain raised showing this beautiful landscape. And Mr. Blodgett also told us, when we arrived, that Admiral Farragut was so enthusiastic over the picture that he left the table and danced a sailors' hornpipe to the delight of the guests.

Forty years after, I had the pleasure of dining in this same house, as the guest of the Rev. Dr. Morgan Dix and his family. The company at dinner were much interested in my account of Mr. Blodgett's dinner given in honor of General Scott and Admiral Farragut so long ago.

After relating many incidents of that dinner, including the sailors' hornpipe, I mentioned something that had impressed me that night, *viz.*, the fact that the tobacco smoke had so quickly vanished from the dining room, despite the large number who were smoking, and that Mr. Blodgett had explained to me that there was a ventilating tube from the center-piece over the chandelier, running from the dining room chimney.

"That," said Dr. Dix, "accounts for the fact that we have found it so difficult to keep this room warm."



CHAPEL AT WEST POINT

West Point

WE were visiting in the neighborhood in November, 1914, and one Sunday morning Mrs. Scrymser and I enjoyed the very great pleasure of attending the morning service in the West Point Chapel, by invitation of the Superintendent, Colonel Townsley.

The Chapel has been referred to as "the gem spot of American architecture." It is situated on a hill and commands a grand view of the Highlands and likewise of the Hudson River. It is built of stone and its simplicity and Gothic grace are very impressive. Combined with the beauty of the Chapel and its historical surroundings, the service itself is one of rare attractiveness. The corps of Cadets, some six hundred strong, in their handsome uniforms, eighty of whom comprise the choir, together with a perfect organ, superbly played, the many war-worn battle flags hung from the ceiling, and the artistic stained glass window in the chancel, bearing the words "Duty, Honor, Country," all contributed to make the service one of rare fascination and one which we shall never forget. It aroused in us a joyous spirit of patriotism, such as we never before experienced.

I have attended services in most of the great cathedrals abroad, but none affected me as did this service in the chapel of our United States Military Academy.

After the service, the organist delighted us with an organ recital which could not be surpassed anywhere. In connection with this fine toned organ, I was surprised to learn that it had not been entirely completed, and that six thousand dollars was still required to make it as it should be. It is unlikely that Congress will ever appropriate the money needed so here is an excellent opportunity for any one interested to give, as a memorial, or otherwise. The organ must have an artistic influence over the lives of the future officers of the Army of our country and it is to be hoped that its early completion is not far off. I was sur-

prised when I was told that the salary of the organist, as authorized by Congress, was only twelve hundred dollars a year. I was informed, however, that, as the organist loves his organ and West Point, he has recently refused several offers of a salary three times as large from churches in New York and elsewhere.

We thoroughly enjoyed our talks with Col. Townsley. One suggestion which the Colonel made impressed me particularly and that was, that an equestrian statue of General Washington, if placed on the Parade Ground, would exert a patriotic influence that would be ideal for good. It will be recalled that General Washington, in association with General Alexander Hamilton and General Henry Knox were the prime movers in causing the West Point Military Academy to be founded, and consequently, Colonel Townsley's suggestion was most appropriate, for it is certainly fitting that the most prominent character of the three named should be thus memorialized.

Colonel Townsley spoke of his admiration of the Washington bronze statue now in Union Square, New York, and said that a duplicate of that statue would be suitable in every way for West Point. There is a good prospect that the Washington statue, as proposed by Col. Townsley, will be placed on the Parade Ground at an early date, provided the consent of the War Department in Washington and likewise of the New York City officials can be obtained.

All Americans should see and know West Point. There is a singular charm about the whole place and I cannot close this account of my experience there without allusion to the rare *esprit de corps* of cadets and graduates. There is a certain friendly intercourse and a loyal affection for one another which clings to the cadets as long as life lasts.

As a proof of this, I may relate an incident which occurred at the Battle of Antietam. It will be remembered that all of our heroes of the Civil War were closely identified with West Point and this incident concerns two of them. It was during a flag of truce, that General William F. Smith, to whom I have frequently referred, sent the following message to his old classmate, General Robert E. Lee:

"Baldy sends his love to Bob."



WASHINGTON STATUE

Thus emphasizing the fact that West Point friendships are maintained on the field of battle.

My visit to the Chapel was one of such delight that I feel I must publish a photograph of the edifice and this I do on the preceding page.

It is appropriate, too, that I should publish the accompanying picture of the Washington Statue, in connection with this comment on my visit to West Point.

NOTE BY AUTHOR.—Just as this book goes to press, I am glad to be able to announce that all arrangements have been concluded for the duplication of the Washington bronze statue, now in Union Square, New York, and the erection of the same on the Parade Ground at West Point. It is expected that this Washington statue will be unveiled at West Point during the coming Summer.

The Use of "Influence"

IN the early days of my telegraph career, with so much depending upon my personal efforts, I often felt that possibly I lacked the courage of my convictions for I was frequently led to rely upon "influential" friends to do what, in time, I found—if I wanted it well done—I had to do myself.

In this connection, I am reminded of a personal friend, who came to me for advice during the war. He was a fellow member of the Atheneum Club and was in financial difficulties. He confided to me that he owed about \$800 and he saw no prospect of being able to pay it. I advised him to enlist in the Army, which he did, and thereby secured a bounty of the very amount (\$800). This he sent to me and with it I paid his debts.

When the war was over, he of course had saved nothing of his soldier's pay. On my advice he drew up an application for a position in the Custom-House and I personally secured the written endorsement of many influential men. The application was regularly filed in the Collector's Office, of the Custom-House. Day after day he would come to my office and complain that he had heard nothing from his application. At length I, too, became impatient and decided to call personally upon the Collector. I cannot recall what I said in behalf of my friend but, when I had finished my appeal, the Collector, Hon. Preston King, arose from his desk and said: "Sir, your friend shall have a \$1,200 position by noon tomorrow; you come here and I will give the order." The Collector was an entire stranger to me and I certainly appreciated his kindness when, at noon, the following day, he handed me the promised appointment for my friend.

On another occasion, General Alexander Webb applied for the appointment as President of the College of the City of New York. An application was duly prepared and endorsed by Peter Cooper, Cyrus W. Field, Moses Taylor, Wilson G. Hunt and others of like prominence. In the course of time, General Webb

informed me that he had received the appointment adding, greatly to my astonishment, that he was not going to accept it. "Why not," I asked. "Why," said he, "because they expect me to teach." I replied, "General, you have too much West Point conscience. You accept that Presidency even if they ask you to black boots and when you are President you can arrange to have others do those odd jobs, instead of yourself." General Webb served as President of the College of the City of New York for nearly forty years, with much credit to himself and immense benefit to many of the young men who were students under him.

After all, if one wants a thing done well and done quickly, he must do it himself. "Influence" is, at times, most effective but personal effort is far more so.

Cuban Independence

SOON after the Civil War there was a movement started both in the United States and Spain for the purpose of securing the freedom and independence of Cuba and Porto Rico. Actively engaged in this scheme were General Butler, then a member of the House of Representatives, General Sickles, United States Minister to Spain, and General Prim, a prominent officer of the Spanish Army, who had served with Maximilian in Mexico.

The plan, as I remember it, was to secure instructions, through our State Department, for General Sickles (our Minister to Spain) to demand, in the name of the United States Government, that Spain should emancipate its slaves in Cuba and Porto Rico and, simultaneously with this demand, General Butler was to introduce a resolution in Congress, recognizing the Cubans as belligerents.

It was likewise planned that a revolution should occur in Madrid, at the same time, to be led by General Prim. General Prim, while en route from Mexico to Spain, in 1862, had stopped in Virginia, where he visited the Army of the Potomac and was the guest of General "Baldy" Smith, who tendered him a review, followed by a Headquarters dinner. Prominent officials of the Army were invited to meet General Prim and, in consequence, he became well known in the United States.

The financing of the scheme for Cuban independence was arranged in this way: there was to be an issue of one hundred million dollars of seven per cent gold bonds, the seven per cent interest to be guaranteed by the United States Government, the latter taking possession of the Cuban Custom-House—to insure the safety of the guarantee; the one hundred millions of dollars was to be paid to Spain upon condition that Cuba should be declared free and independent. The whole scheme was a big one and such schemes, planned on conditions so wide apart, must of necessity fail.

General Sickles' demand for the emancipation of the Cuban slaves had very much the same effect on the Spanish people, who were a unit in opposition, as the firing on Fort Sumter had on our people of the North. The Spanish Government learned of General Prim's intended leadership in the revolution and he was straightway assassinated.

General "Baldy" Smith (who was an associate with me in the West India cable enterprise) was a go-between for the Cuban rebel leaders in Washington and the plotting Spanish officials in Madrid, which he frequently visited, in connection with our Cuban-Porto Rico cable enterprise.

At the time of General Sickles' demand upon Spain, Smith was in Madrid. I received a telegram from him, asking me to see General Butler who, it was planned, was to introduce the resolution in Congress recognizing the independence of Cuba.

I knew nothing of the scheme but, in response to General Smith's request, I went on to Washington to see General Butler. I showed him my code message from General Smith, in Madrid, the closing paragraph of which was "Tell General Butler there is ducats in it." This sentence seemed to catch his attention at once and he said to me, "Captain, what does that mean?" I, laughingly replied, "General, that is the Spanish for spoons." "All right," he said, "meet me at the Astor House, New York, tomorrow afternoon at four o'clock." I did so and after an hour's conference with him he confided to me that the scheme had failed and that Sickles had blundered by delaying the American demand. "Here we are," he said, "at the end of December, on the verge of the holidays, Congress will adjourn in a few days and nothing can be done until it reopens the middle of January; by that time the scheme will have grown cold. Please cable General Smith that nothing can be done at present."


Field Marshal Oyama

IN the winter of 1898 I visited Japan. My stay there was a most delightful one and I was privileged to meet many of Japan's leading men. They were all extremely hospitable and courteous. I shall never forget the many pleasant interviews I had with Field Marshal Oyama, with whom it was my good fortune to become quite intimate. The Field Marshal was a very intelligent man and his stories of Japan's progress were exceedingly interesting. We exchanged "war" experiences.

In discussing the capture of Port Arthur in the war between Japan and China, in 1894-5, the Field Marshal told me that Japan's Bureau of Information had misled him at that time. The Bureau had assured him that the Chinese army was strong and efficient, but that the Chinese navy was weak, but experience proved that it was just the other way and China's navy was strong while its army was weak. "Had I known these facts," added the Field Marshal, "I would have marched on Peking and taken it, instead of Port Arthur."

If Japan had done so there would have been another story to tell. This lack of information indicates what great improvement has been made in Japan in recent years.

The adjoining illustration is an enlargement of a picture sent to me by Field Marshal Oyama, representing the last grand review of the triumphant Japanese army, numbering one hundred thousand men, at the close of the Russian-Japanese War. The Emperor of Japan accompanied by Field Marshal Oyama will be seen in the Imperial carriage, at the head of the reviewing party.



J. C. G. G. G.



The History of Three Cable Companies

I

International Ocean Telegraph Company

THE close of the Civil War found many a soldier without means of livelihood and undecided as to a life's occupation. I was one of them. Upon my return from the war, in the spring of 1865, I naturally gave the matter much earnest consideration. I was living at the time at Riverdale, in Westchester County, New York.

Several weeks passed by and no decision was made. I knew that it was necessary that a decision should be made—and be made soon—and finally determined to seek inspiration in the mountains of western Massachusetts and, with my friend, Mr. Alfred Pell, planned a tramping tour through that beautiful country.


On the last Monday in May, in 1865, Mr. Pell and I left Riverdale on our journey in quest of inspiration. We walked to the Century House near the old Fordham Bridge—there planning to take the Harlem River boat, the "*Water Lily*," to Harlem. From Harlem we purposed taking the train to Copake and, from the latter place, to start on our long walk over Mount Washington, in Berkshire County, thence on to Vermont.

"God moves in a mysterious way His Wonders to perform." The "*Water Lily*" had broken down and was not to make her usual trip that day! This mishap was a keen disappointment to both of us and, of course, necessitated a change in our plans. After a brief conference it was decided to go "into camp" on the river bank and await the repairs to the damaged "*Water Lily*." I owe a debt of gratitude to the "*Water Lily*" for breaking down that Monday morning in May, 1865, for there, on the banks of the Harlem, came the inspiration and the decision was made. And it all came about through a simple question.

Mr. Pell, it seems, was the owner of ten shares of the original Atlantic Cable Company's stock and in the course of conversation, told me of a circular which he had received from that Company offering to issue to him twenty new shares in lieu of his original holding, provided that he would subscribe for ten more. Mr. Pell was undecided what to do and he asked my advice. I promptly advised him to accept the offer, for I felt that it was only a question of time when the whole world would be connected by cables. To support my advice, I mentioned the fact that I had often thought a cable connecting the United States with Cuba and the West Indies would be a paying undertaking, provided one company could secure the absolute control for the establishment of such a cable line.

The mention of an "absolute control" suggested to Mr. Pell a recent visit he had made to Havana, in the previous winter, and he spoke of an influential concern in that city which had actually secured the exclusive right for fishing in Spanish waters, within fifty miles of Havana, and, Mr. Pell observed casually, that if a monopoly could be obtained for fishing it would seem to be a simple matter to obtain a monopoly for operating cables within Spanish jurisdiction.

Mr. Pell's simple question, asking for my advice as to cable shares, and his reference to the Havana fishing monopoly, combined possibly with the waters of the Harlem River lying at our feet, furnished the inspiration, and the "*Water Lily*" and the tramp through the Berkshires were forgotten or rather abandoned. After Mr. Pell had finished speaking, I jumped to my feet, put on my knapsack and started to go. Mr. Pell looked up and, in surprise, asked where I was going. My reply was both quick and decisive, "I am going for that monopoly." Thus began my entry into the Cable world. Mr. Pell and I decided to start for New York immediately and we were there within two hours. We straightway visited the offices of Messrs. Grinnell, Minturn & Company, one of the most prominent New York firms engaged in the West Indies trade. We were received very kindly and courteously by Mr. Robert B. Minturn, who listened attentively to my enthusiastic portrayal of the Florida-Cuba-West Indies Cable scheme. Mr. Minturn promised to take the matter under



CENTURY HOUSE, HARLEM RIVER, 1861

The birthplace of Captain Strymser's cable career. The "Water Lily," mentioned in the reminiscences, may be seen on the right of the picture

consideration and said that he would consult some of his friends and be able to give a definite answer, as to what he would do, the following day at noon.

Promptly at noon, the next day, I returned to Mr. Minturn's office. Mr. Minturn informed me that he had consulted with Moses Taylor, one of the great West India merchants at that time, and that they both thought the scheme, which I had suggested, was one of much merit. Mr. Minturn added, however, that both he and Mr. Taylor had grave doubts as to its success. Despite the latter discouragement, they each agreed to take a third interest in the proposed cable project, offering the remaining third to Mr. Pell and me, upon the understanding that Mr. Pell and I were to do all the work and that neither Mr. Minturn nor Mr. Taylor were to be mentioned in the matter. It seems they did not wish their names associated, in any way, with a failure! They were willing, nevertheless, to finance the enterprise and pay all the expenses and cost of establishment and they must have had, in consequence, a far greater faith in the project than they were then willing to admit. We accepted the very generous offer and started actively in pursuit of the necessary concessions.

That night I took the train for Washington, hoping to obtain letters of recommendation and introduction from the Department of State to the American Consul in Havana and, through the latter, reach the Spanish Governor-General of Cuba.

Mr. Seward, then Secretary of State, was just recovering from an attempted assassination, part of the conspiracy which led to the death of President Lincoln. Secretary Seward, of course, could not see me, and the State Department in charge of Mr. Henry, the Chief Clerk, declined to assist me. Fortunately, I had a personal friend who was the Secretary of the British Legation and I applied to him, asking him to secure for me a letter from Sir Frederick W. A. Bruce, the British Ambassador to the United States, introducing me to Captain-General Concha of Cuba. This letter I obtained Wednesday afternoon and on the following Saturday, I sailed for Havana, fortified with letters of introduction, not only to the Captain-General, but from Grinnell, Minturn & Company, New York, to the prominent commercial houses in Havana. Through the influence of the latter,

I obtained an interview with the Captain-General within forty-eight hours of my arrival in Cuba. His Excellency received me most courteously and promised to do everything in his power to aid me in my cable undertaking, realizing, as he did, that if the Atlantic cable was a success, Madrid would be within one hour's cable communication with Havana.

A formal application for a concession was then prepared and, bearing the endorsement of the Captain-General, was forwarded by the first mail steamer to Madrid. The Captain-General informed me that it would be about the first of September before I could expect a reply from Madrid, and, in consequence, he advised me to return to New York, as the yellow fever was prevalent in Havana at that time. I thanked him for the advice, but decided to remain in Havana until I heard the result of my application. Those were anxious days and I eagerly watched the arrival of every Spanish mail steamer. Finally, at the end of August, in calling upon the Captain-General, I was received by his secretary, who had news for me, but not the news that I was looking for! You may imagine my disappointment, my bitter disappointment, when the secretary told me that he had just received a copy of the "Diario Oficial" containing a Decree which granted to Messrs. Arturo Marcoartu, the Marquises of Mariano and Manzanedo, the Count of Esteban de Canongo, Michael Chevalier, Ferdinand de Lesseps and Leopold Werner, authority to establish the very cable connection for which I had petitioned. I was stunned, and upon examination of the Royal Decree found that the language of the same was identical with the wording of my own petition! I instantly realized that the Royal Decree was the key to the whole situation. The secretary of the Captain-General was kind enough to furnish me with a copy of it and I returned to New York for conference with my associates, Messrs. Minturn and Taylor. The latter two said it was useless to go further with the scheme and withdrew, offering to pay all of my expenses, which up to that time amounted to \$800. I asked Messrs. Minturn and Taylor for letters formally withdrawing from the scheme and said that I would personally assume all expenditures.

My next step was to give the Royal Decree proper publicity



Amos P. Allen

in the United States and I arranged with a Captain Starr, who had served as a gallant officer in the Army of the Potomac and was then in charge of the *New York Herald's* foreign news bureau, to give it the desired publicity. I prepared a statement for publication in the *Herald*, in which I incorporated a translation of the Royal Decree of June 30, 1865, granting to Marcoartu and his associates the concession for the Cuban-American Cable. The article called the attention of the United States Government and all of the Chambers of Commerce in the country to the dangers of such a concession, showing that American commerce would suffer and that a Spanish-owned cable monopoly would control the sugar markets of the world. The article clearly stated that it was the duty of the United States Government to prohibit the landing of such a Spanish cable on the coast of the United States unless reciprocal rights for an American cable were granted by Spain. It further emphasized the fact that the Royal Decree was identical with my application of early June and quoted dates to prove that there was just time for the arrival of my application in Madrid, the copying of the same, and the formal reissuance thereof in the names of the parties above mentioned, instead of in my own name.

Armed with the *New York Herald* and a copy of the Royal Decree, I immediately went to Washington, and called on the Honorable William H. Seward, the Secretary of State, who had by that time fully recovered. I had never met Secretary Seward, but he received me most kindly. In a few words I explained to the Secretary the trouble that had come to my American project and the fact that I had been robbed of the concession. I told him that as the law stood at that time there was nothing to prohibit the landing of a Spanish cable on our shores, provided the parties interested owned the property on which the cable was to be landed. Secretary Seward became very much interested; he arose from his desk and walked to and fro in his office. He finally stopped and turning to me said, "Young man, you are mistaken, the three-mile limit off shore is to prohibit an enemy from erecting a battery which would be dangerous to the upland. A cable being silent and secret in its operation, is many times more dangerous than an enemy's battery." He then advised me to

lay my scheme before the United States Congress and assured me that I would have his personal assistance in obtaining rights sufficient to checkmate the Spanish concessionaires. Acting upon Secretary Seward's advice, I formed a Company under the laws of the State of New York, 'The International Ocean Telegraph Company, the incorporators being James A. Scrymser, Alfred Pell, Alexander Hamilton, Jr., Oliver K. King, Maturin L. Delafield, Major-General William F. Smith and James M. Digges, the latter my brother-in-law.

A Bill was formally introduced in Congress in December, 1865, granting to The International Ocean Telegraph Company the sole right to establish cables between Florida and the West Indies for a period of fourteen years (that being the duration of the patent right to which Mr. Seward considered I was entitled and of which I was deprived by the action of the Spanish Government). The Bill passed the House unanimously and finally passed the Senate after a sharp fight.

General William F. Smith (commonly called "Baldy") had left the United States service at the close of the war. I had served as his Aide-de-camp in many battles between the years of 1861 and 1865. General Smith wrote to me from Chicago, saying that he had seen my name associated with a cable enterprise which he thought possessed much merit. General Smith asked if there was any show for him in the project, adding that if there was, he would be very glad to offer his services, for, he said, if General Grant is made President, he will send me to Alaska (because of an unfortunate quarrel Smith had had with Grant and others in the Army).

I at once called a meeting of my associates for the purpose of formal organization. General William F. Smith was elected President of the Company with a salary of \$10,000 a year and \$100,000 of stock, contributed by myself and friends. The new President, General Smith, at once departed for Madrid with letters from Secretary Seward and others to the then American Minister, Hon. John P. Hale. General Smith was successful in proving conclusively that the concession granted on the 30th of June, 1865, to Marcoartu and his associates was a palpable fraud. This was a simple matter to do as I had already ob-

tained letters from Marcoartu's associates, the Marquises of Mariano and Manzanedo, the Count of Esteban de Canongo, Ferdinand de Lesseps and others, stating that their names had been used by Marcoartu without authority, and each gentleman authorized me to say that he had withdrawn from any connection with Marcoartu's enterprise. General Smith, in view of all this, soon obtained a Royal Decree annulling the Marcoartu Concession and granting to General Smith, as representative of The International Ocean Telegraph Company, a concession covering all of the rights for which I had originally asked. This concession was dated Madrid, June 17, 1866. General Smith was very largely aided in his negotiations with the Spanish Government by Horatio J. Perry, the Secretary of the United States Legation at Madrid. This concession was subsequently made an exclusive one for a period of forty years and expired June 17, 1906.

Based on this concession and exclusive rights granted by the United States Congress dated May 5, 1866, and signed by President Andrew Johnson, The International Ocean Telegraph Company was completely organized and the contract for the cable was made with The India Rubber, Gutta Percha and Telegraph Works Company, Limited, of London and, later, the cable was successfully laid between Punta Rassa, Florida and Havana, *via* Key West.

The cable was first opened to the public in December, 1866, and, from the start, its traffic was large and profitable. The first tariff, I remember, was \$10 for a message of ten words and \$1.00 for each word in excess.

Unfortunately, General Smith, who was a very ambitious man, quarreled with Cyrus W. Field and the Western Union Telegraph Company officials, and the quarrel resulted in the Western Union finally obtaining control of The International Ocean Telegraph Company.

In December, 1866, General E. S. Sanford, President of the American Telegraph Company, and Dr. Norvin Green, called upon me to demand, in the name of their Company, that the International Ocean Telegraph Company should enter into an agreement with the American Telegraph Company whereby the

latter's lines should not be extended northward beyond the city of Gainesville, Georgia, and that all Florida and West India traffic to places north of Gainesville should be handed to the American Telegraph Company, the arrangement being reciprocal on south-bound traffic.

The International Ocean Telegraph Company, under this agreement, was to retain control over all Florida and West India traffic. (The American Telegraph Company afterwards became the Western Union Telegraph Company.)

I foresaw the value of the future Florida traffic and at once advised that the International Ocean Telegraph Company should enter into the thirty-year agreement proposed by Dr. Norvin Green and his associates. An agreement, on the lines mentioned, was made and it is needless to state that, within the thirty years, the Florida traffic proved of great value, greater than all of the West India traffic combined.

Subsequently, General E. S. Sanford and William G. Fargo, through powers of attorney issued by the International Ocean Telegraph Company to that Company's agent, Baron von Hippel, obtained concessions and subsidies from the more important West India Islands, amounting to £17,000 per annum. Based upon these concessions, the West India and Panama Telegraph Company, an English corporation, was formed. That Company laid its cables from Cienfuegos to Santiago, Cuba, thence to Colon, on the Isthmus of Panama, and through the West India Islands as far as Demerara, with the ultimate intention of extending the same to Brazil. It was later discovered, however, that the Brazilian Government had already granted to the Brazilian Submarine Telegraph Company (afterwards the Western Telegraph Company) an exclusive right to the entire coast of Brazil for a period of sixty years from March, 1870. This, of course, blocked the proposed Brazil extension of the West India and Panama Telegraph Company.

An extension from Panama, southward, on the Pacific side, was thought to be impracticable, because of the fact that the Panama Railroad Company, which held the transit monopoly of the Isthmus of Panama, demanded such a large share of the tolls for carrying the traffic across the Isthmus. The Panama

Railroad Company's proportion was so large that there would have been very little profit left for any cable extension South of Panama. It was also a recognized fact that the South American Republics were decidedly unwilling to have their messages routed by way of Cuba for, at that time, there was an exceedingly hostile feeling upon the part of those republics against the mother country, Spain.

In 1878, Mr. Jay Gould secured control of the International Ocean Telegraph Company and its capital was increased from \$1,500,000 to \$3,000,000, the Western Union Telegraph Company leasing the Company for ninety-nine years and guaranteeing six per cent on the increased capital. About this time I left the Board of Directors of the International Ocean Telegraph Company, as I saw no prospect of the extension of its lines. I could foresee the value of extension southward and it is a regrettable fact that I met with nothing but discouragement from those who were well informed in regard to the commercial conditions in South America, with the single exception of the late J. Pierpont Morgan.

2

Mexican Telegraph Company

After retiring from the Board of Directors of the International Ocean Telegraph Company, I turned my attention toward Mexico and Central and South America. For seven years I had been planning a telegraph communication with those countries.

It will be recalled that General Diaz had become President of Mexico as a revolutionist and the United States Government in consequence had refused for many years to recognize the Government of Mexico. President Diaz and his government were finally recognized by the United States in 1879. Because of this non-recognition I had been forced to keep my Mexican scheme a profound secret. When the recognition finally came, I felt that it was time to act.


As a preliminary step I applied to the Western Union Telegraph Company for a contract for the handling of all of its Mexican and Central American traffic. I was told that there was no business with Mexico worth my while to exploit and that the

Western Union Telegraph Company did not find its Mexican traffic at all profitable. I was persistent, however, and finally concluded a satisfactory contract with the Western Union Telegraph Company.

Armed with this contract, I went to Mexico in 1879 with letters of introduction from the proprietors of the Alexandre Steamship Company, then operating a line of steamers between New York and Vera Cruz. These letters of introduction resulted in my interesting two influential Mexican gentlemen, Señor Don Ramon G. Guzman and Señor Don Sebastian Camacho. These gentlemen arranged for a personal interview between General Diaz and myself. General Diaz was most courteous and foresaw the necessity of reliable cable communication with Mexico. In less than a week a contract was signed by President Diaz, granting to the Mexican Telegraph Company permission to establish its cables and lines, connecting the City of Mexico, Vera Cruz and Tampico with a station in the State of Texas.

Arrangements were made for the exchange of Mexican and Central American traffic with the Western Union Telegraph Company's lines at Galveston, Texas, and the cable was laid and in operation within one year of the signing of the contract. Contrary to the discouraging view of Mr. William Orton, then President of the Western Union Telegraph Company, the VIA GALVESTON route was a success from the start and immediately became a valuable and growing feeder to the lines of the Western Union Telegraph Company.

Mr. Orton's misjudgment of the value of the Mexican traffic reminds me of the time he refused to take an interest in the Bell Telephone invention. In the early days of that invention, at the request of Mr. Hilborne Roosevelt, of New York, I interviewed Mr. Orton with the view of having his company take an interest in pushing the new invention. Mr. Roosevelt held an option on the Bell patents for the State of New York and these were subject to a royalty of \$8,000 a year. I was told by Mr. Orton that "Telephony was a thing like the comet then in the heavens, magnificent, but no good." I remember replying to Mr. Orton that the time would come when the telephone would largely supersede the Western Union Telegraph Company.



CENTRAL AND SOUTH AMERICAN TELEGRAPH CO. BUILDING,
BUENOS AIRES, ARGENTINE

The Mexican Telegraph Company has always been most fortunate in the personnel of its Boards of Directors; men of distinction and standing, and I have counted it a privilege indeed to associate with men like John W. Auchincloss, Edmund L. Baylies, R. Fulton Cutting, John J. Pierpont, Percy R. Pyne, William Emlen Roosevelt, Charles Howland Russell and Cornelius Vanderbilt, comprising the present Board.

I have already referred to Señor Don Sebastian Camacho, of the City of Mexico. Señor Camacho has acted as the Company's Resident Vice-President in that City for many years and it is a pleasure to testify to his fidelity and ability and his zeal for the Company's interests.

3

Central and South American Telegraph Company


The Mexican Telegraph Company was so highly successful that I determined to lose no time in extending the system to Central and South America, operating the same under a separate company, to be known as the Central and South American Telegraph Company.

It was necessary, of course, to interest capital in the enterprise and, with that in view, I called upon Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan, then a Director in the Mexican Telegraph Company, to explain my scheme. In the course of our conversation, I casually intimated that I purposed going to London to raise the necessary capital there. Mr. Morgan quickly responded (as I thought he would do) that I could do better in New York than I could in London, and he immediately invited me to meet some of his friends at the Union League Club the following evening at dinner. The dinner was a most enjoyable affair and Mr. Morgan had as his guests, among others, Edward D. Adams, Charles Lanier and John W. Ellis. The conversation was most general and not a word was said about cable enterprises until the coffee and cigars were served. It was then that Mr. Morgan turned to me and asked me to explain my Central and South American Cable scheme. I did so as briefly and as concisely as possible, and Mr. Morgan and the others seemed to be greatly interested.


After I had finished my explanation, Mr. Morgan asked me in that quick and decisive way for which he was famous, "How much money do you need?" I replied, "Five million dollars." Mr. Morgan came back with, "Can't you get along with less than five million?" "Not a cent less," I replied, for I knew that it was a hazardous undertaking and I wanted to be sure that I would have enough money to meet any contingency which might arise. In less than ten minutes the money was promised and an agreement effected whereby I was to have four millions of dollars on demand and the banking houses of Drexel, Morgan & Company, Winslow, Lanier & Company and Drexel & Company were to advance me another million, if required.

The Central and South American Telegraph Company was a paying undertaking from the start, and the wisdom of its promoters was fully justified. When the Company opened its lines to the public in 1882, the rate between the United States and Buenos Aires was \$7.50 per word, New York, San Francisco, etc., being counted as two words. The present rate between the Argentine Republic, Chile, Peru and the United States is 65 cents per word and the average time of transmission between Buenos Aires and New York City is about twenty minutes. The Company has been of inestimable service to American commerce and American diplomacy and, I repeat, the wisdom of its promoters has been fully justified.

The Central and South American Telegraph Company has also been fortunate in the personnel of its Boards of Directors, men of distinction and note, highly respected in many walks of life. The present board consists of Edward D. Adams, Robert W. de Forest, William Pierson Hamilton, J. Montgomery Hare, Francis L. Higginson, Charles Lanier, William Emlen Roosevelt and William D. Sloane; association with these men has been a rare privilege.



MEXICAN TELEGRAPH CO.
CENTRAL & SOUTH AMERICAN TELEGRAPH CO.



Central & South American Telegraph Co.

Submarine Cables

In Gulf of Mexico.....	328 Nautical Miles
In Atlantic Ocean (in joint ownership of New York- Colon Cable with Mexi- can Telegraph Co.).....	3,033 "
In Pacific Ocean.....	11,819 "

15,180 Nautical Miles


Landlines

Isthmus of Tehuantepec.....	191 Statute Miles
" " Panama (Cable)...	50 "
Guayaquil Landline.....	93 "
Transandine Landline.....	1,356 "
" " (Moun- tain Cables).....	40 "

1,730 Statute Miles

Joint Cable Repair Fleet

Steamer "Guardian".....	1,800 Tons
" "Relay".....	1,200 "



Map of the Mexican and Central and South American Telegraph Co.'s Systems

THE accompanying map clearly describes the VIA GALVESTON and VIA COLON systems of the Mexican Telegraph Company and the Central and South American Telegraph Company. On the map, I have inserted the duplicate New York-Colon Cable, which is to be laid within a few months, and, by means of dotted lines, have shown the proposed new extensions from Buenos Aires, in the Argentine, to Santos and Rio de Janeiro, in the Republic of Brazil.

With the map there is printed mileage summaries of cables and landlines. These summaries include the new duplicate New York-Colon Cable about to be laid, but do not include the new cables from Buenos Aires to Santos and Rio de Janeiro, about 1200 miles and 1300 miles, respectively.

It is an impressive fact that the cables of the Central and South American Telegraph Company rest on the bottom at a depth of 18,000 feet in the Pacific Ocean and at a height of 12,000 feet at the highest point in the Andes, making a total measurement of six miles from the bottom of the Pacific Ocean to the top of the Andes mountains.

Genius of Electricity

THE accompanying illustration is a photograph of a very handsome and unique gift with which I was honored in 1885. The "Genius of Electricity" is a beautiful bronze and surmounts a clock in the shape of the globe.

The gift is explained in the following correspondence:

NEW YORK, November 27, 1885.

DEAR MR. SCRYMSER:

Please accept the accompanying "Genius of Electricity" as an evidence of our appreciation of your singleness of purpose, your untiring application, and your skilful management in the protection and development of the cable business in which we are mutually interested.

Sincerely yours,

DREXEL, MORGAN & Co.

WINSLOW, LANIER & Co.

DREXEL & Co.

James A. Scrymser, Esq.,
Present.

CENTRAL AND SOUTH AMERICAN TELEGRAPH CO.

NEW YORK, December 7, 1885.

GENTLEMEN:

I sincerely thank you for the beautiful gift received on Saturday last, of the "Genius of Electricity," and your complimentary letter accompanying it.

In reciprocating your congratulations I must disclaim having done more than my duty to yourselves and others, without whose aid and encouragement this cable enterprise could not have realized so signal a success.

With such sentiments of mutual confidence I feel assured that our good work must prosper and extend. I am, gentlemen,

Your obedient servant,

JAMES A. SCRYMSER.

Messrs. Drexel, Morgan & Co.

Messrs. Winslow, Lanier & Co.

Messrs. Drexel & Co.



GENIUS OF ELECTRICITY

Presented to Captain Scrymser by Drexel, Morgan and Co.; Winslow,
Lanier and Co.; Drexel and Co.

Extension to Brazil

THE cable system of the Central and South American Telegraph Company now extends as far as Buenos Aires in the Argentine Republic.

Because of exclusive concessions granted by Brazil to English companies, we have been unable to extend our cables to Brazil. For the perfection of the Central and South American cable system I have striven incessantly for forty-six years to gain cable landings there. The exclusive English concessions referred to have recently lapsed and, if all goes well, the lines of the Central and South American Telegraph Company will be landed in Rio de Janeiro and in Santos, Brazil, before many months, by authority of the Brazilian Government.

It is unnecessary to make detailed mention of my efforts to reach Brazil. It will be of interest, however, if I insert in these reminiscences the initial correspondence between Secretary of State, Hon. William H. Seward, and myself, as follows:

NEW YORK, March 26, 1868.

HON. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State,
Washington.

SIR:

As the projector and a Director of the International Ocean Telegraph Co. (Cuba and Florida Telegraph), I desire to obtain from the Government of Brazil the necessary aid and authority to extend the lines of the Co. over the West India Islands to a convenient point on the coast of Brazil.

With the view of effecting the accomplishment of this important enterprise, I have the honor respectfully to request that you be pleased to authorize and instruct our Minister to Brazil to present to that Government the application forwarded for that purpose by the mail steamer which left for Rio de Janeiro on the 22nd inst.

I have the honor to be, Sir,

Very respectfully,

JAMES A. SCRYMSEK.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
WASHINGTON, March 30, 1868.

JAS. WATSON WEBB, ESQ.,
&c., &c., Rio de Janeiro.

SIR:

I herewith enclose to you a copy of a communication addressed to this Department by Jas. A. Scrymser, Esqr., projector and a Director of the International Ocean Telegraph Company desiring to obtain aid and authority from the Brazilian Government to extend the lines of his Company over the West India Islands to a convenient point on the coast of Brazil.

You are instructed to give such assistance as may be in your power towards effecting the accomplishment of the object in view.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

W. H. SEWARD.

Even in those early days, Secretary of State Seward foresaw the strategic value of cables to this Government and the vital importance of an American-owned cable system with Mexico, Central and South America, and his distinguished successors have, like him, rendered me every possible assistance in my endeavor to secure for the United States of America an all-American cable system to the south of us.

The Monroe Doctrine makes such a system doubly imperative.

The establishment of these all-American lines is of vital national importance. If these same lines had been established by foreigners the United States Government, in case of war, might be debarred from making use of them, especially so if the question of neutrality were enforced.

Side-Lights on Cable Management

IN its early days the Central and South American Telegraph Company, like many South American enterprises, discovered that investors were critical and fearful of South American revolutions, earthquakes, etc. I never shared in these fears and in all of my forty-seven years of experience in dealing with twenty-one nationalities, I have had less trouble with all of them together than I have had with the United States Government during the past five years.

In fact, I recall but two instances in which the Central and South American Telegraph Company has met with any difficulty, once in Guatemala and once in Chile.

In Guatemala, the cable ship "*Silvertown*" was about to land our cable at San José, under an exclusive concession, which Guatemala had granted to the Central and South American Telegraph Company. It so happened that on the very day planned for the landing of our cable at San José, I noticed an article in a newspaper to the effect that Guatemala had also granted a concession to an English company, for the laying of a cable between Guatemala, on the Atlantic side, with Cuba. This concession was, of course, entirely contrary to the exclusive concession which Guatemala had granted to our Company. In consequence, I immediately ordered the cable ship not to land the cable at San José, Guatemala, but to proceed to La Libertad, San Salvador. This action made Guatemala wholly dependent upon cable communication through San Salvador. Such routing was not what Guatemala wanted and Guatemala showed much jealousy in the matter and ultimately a war took place between Guatemala and Salvador. The war was a long one and Guatemala came out bankrupt despite the fact that previously the country had been in a most prosperous condition. In the final battle the President of Guatemala, Señor Barrios, was killed and his Army defeated.

Year after year Guatemala sent delegations to us in New York urging independent cable connection. These delegations were always told that if Guatemala would deposit \$200,000 in gold and guarantee a contract which would not be violated, as the first contract had been, cable communication with Guatemala would be established. Our offer was finally agreed to and a day was fixed for the landing of the cable at San José, Guatemala. The President of Guatemala and his staff, in gorgeous uniforms, journeyed to San José in a private car stocked with champagne and other luxuries. Messages had been prepared for transmission to the Royalties of Europe and to the President of the United States, but, unfortunately for the festivities, a decline in silver had taken place and we were short \$5,000 gold in the currency equivalent of the \$200,000 gold which the Government was to pay us. I positively declined to open the cable until that balance was deposited. The President of Guatemala proposed to arbitrate the matter, which I declined. They drank their champagne and in the course of the following week the balance was made good and the cable opened to the public.

In Chile, we had trouble during the Balmaceda revolution. The navy remained loyal and the headquarters of the Government were transferred from Santiago to Iquique, where the Congress met aboard ship and the Government was carried on in the most formal manner. The southern part of Chile was under the control of the Balmaceda party and our manager was verbally ordered to close the cable. On being informed of this demand, I instructed our manager to require a written order and not to accept verbal orders. Upon receipt of a written order, the Valparaiso end of the cable was closed and the Company suffered a considerable loss of traffic, in consequence. At the conclusion of the war it was arranged that all American claims should be settled by arbitration and, because of the written order which we presented, the Board of Arbitration awarded our Company \$28,298.

Wireless Competition

IN my experience as President of the Mexican Telegraph Company and Central and South American Telegraph Company, I have found considerable apprehension among the shareholders, during the past ten years, over possible competition resulting from a perfected wireless telegraphy. Although I have realized the immense value of wireless telegraphy, I have not shared in this solicitude.

Recent events in Vera Cruz have shown that our Companies have little to fear from wireless competition in the tropics. As an evidence, I may cite the fact that the United States Government has established wireless stations on the Isthmus of Panama; at Guantanamo, Cuba; at Key West, Florida; at Pensacola, Florida; and at Arlington, near Washington; all at a cost estimated at over four million dollars and the further significant fact, that during the first three months of our military occupation of Vera Cruz over thirty United States naval vessels, fully equipped with the most costly wireless apparatus, have failed to establish satisfactory wireless communication between Vera Cruz and the Government stations mentioned. Most, if not all, of the official telegrams between the military and naval forces at Vera Cruz and places in the United States were transmitted over the cables of the Mexican Telegraph Company and to the entire satisfaction of United States Government officials.

It is curious, too, to note that the newspaper reports, at that time, mentioned on a number of occasions that wireless communication between our naval vessels at Vera Cruz and Tampico, a distance of about 220 miles, had been frequently interrupted and delayed because of local thunderstorms and consequent electrical disturbances.

Mr. Jay Gould's Opposition

IN speaking of the organization of the Central and South American Telegraph Company, the readers of my reminiscences will, I am sure, be interested in one incident of early opposition to the scheme for which I had worked so zealously.

When we were ready to launch the Company, we naturally issued a Prospectus, containing map and full information of the commerce and population of Central and South America.

One day, shortly after the issuance of this Prospectus, a boy applied at my office for a copy. He was an entire stranger and there was something in his manner which aroused my suspicion. I told my office boy to give him the Prospectus but to follow him, when he went out, and if possible locate where he came from. Within a short time my "detective" returned, having successfully located the messenger to whom the Prospectus had been delivered, and reported to me that the "other boy" belonged to the office of the President of the Western Union Telegraph Company.

That afternoon I took occasion to drop into the Executive Office of the Western Union, knowing that they had had time to dissect and digest the Prospectus of the Central and South American Telegraph Company, for which they had sent that morning. I was greeted by the Vice-President, General Eckert, and then, for the first time, met Mr. Jay Gould.

Mr. Gould "looked me over" thoroughly. I could see that his mind was fixed upon the Central and South American Telegraph Company's Prospectus and that he did not realize that I was the man who had played a rather important part in the promotion of the International Ocean Telegraph Company, operating a cable between Florida and Cuba.

Mr. Gould said to me, "Why didn't you bring that South American cable scheme to this office—this is the headquarters of all such schemes and where they receive prompt attention?"

He then paused, finally adding, in slowly measured words, "I want to tell you, sir, I intend to oppose you!" I realized at once the great importance of a prompt counter offensive movement and replied: "Mr. Gould, people who live in glass houses must not throw stones. You think your Havana cable has a monopoly, I presume?" "I don't *think* anything about it, I *know*," was his quick rejoinder, to which I answered, "I organized that Company (International Ocean Telegraph Company) and know it better than you do and know, too, that you have doubled its capital to three millions of dollars and have caused the Western Union to guarantee six per cent. interest upon the whole amount. We may as well understand one another at once, Mr. Gould. You tell me you are going to oppose my South American cable scheme; if you do, I will attack your Havana cable scheme." "Go ahead," replied Mr. Gould, "and it will be a fight to the finish." After this interview you may be sure that I kept my eyes and ears open.

Shortly after, I learned that General Grant was in the City of Mexico, as the agent of Jay Gould and under "orders" to have our Mexican concession canceled or to obtain another for a cable which could parallel ours. In course of time it transpired that General Grant was the innocent but influential agent of Mr. Gould for promoting the Gould railroad system, with Mexico as its terminal.

Realizing that a combination such as General Grant and Jay Gould was an "opposition" that required decisive action, I at once cabled to London, instructing my agents there to obtain for the Central and South American Telegraph Company a concession from the Spanish Government for the laying of a cable between Havana and Vera Cruz. This concession was promptly secured.

Of course, the Western Union and Mr. Gould soon learned of my flank move on Havana. Some time later, I met General Grant in New York. He had just returned from Mexico and I referred to his work there for a telegraph concession. General Grant replied that he was simply obeying the "orders" of Mr. Gould.¹

¹ It was indeed a painful sight to me to see the first General of the United States Army and an ex-President of the United States acting as Mr. Gould's agent, going from

Mr. Jay Gould did not secure the telegraph concession from Mexico, but he did learn of my success in securing the concession from Spain.

Shortly after Spain had granted the concession for a cable between Havana and Vera Cruz, on my trip downtown one morning, on the Third Avenue elevated, I noticed a man, seated opposite, buried in his newspaper, but occasionally looking over its top at me. I soon discovered that it was Mr. Jay Gould and I made up my mind to pass him by as if he were an entire stranger.

As I walked up William Street, someone seized me by the elbow and said he would like to have a few words with me. It was Mr. Gould. As it was raining hard, we stepped into the doorway of one of the large office buildings. Mr. Gould opened the conversation. "Mr. Scrymser," he said, "you will recall our conversation in the Western Union building. I have been thinking it over and have concluded that there is no reason why our interests should conflict and I wish to say, Mr. Scrymser, that I have decided not to oppose your scheme." I replied, "Mr. Gould, you are too late. I have planned to extend our cable to Havana."

He looked at me sharply and then advised that I should see General Eckert, the Vice-President of the Western Union Telegraph Company, saying that he would see him himself in the meantime. He then expressed the hope that we could come to a peaceful understanding. I told Mr. Gould that General Eckert knew where my office was and that if he had anything to propose I should be very glad to see him. General Eckert called on me later and the Gould opposition was formally withdrawn, Mr. Gould agreeing to defray the expense of the one thousand pounds deposit which my agents had made for me in Madrid.

This contest occurred about thirty-five years ago; since that time my relations with the Western Union Telegraph Company have been most satisfactory and cordial in every respect.

office to office in New York to collect the ten per cent. dues on syndicate subscriptions to the "Occidental Railway," which railway Mr. Gould was then picturing to the public as an "international" railroad scheme. General Grant was evidently unaware that he was performing a work usually performed by office boys and, in his innocence, was evidently proud of the fact that he was the personal representative of a railway scheme which was being "boomed" largely through his own personality, with good effect in New York and Europe. It is needless to add that the Occidental Company, which was to control all the railway systems of Mexico, never materialized and the Wabash and other railroads which were to connect with the Occidental have been repeatedly in the hands of receivers since that time.

Count Ferdinand de Lesseps

A STORY of the start of the Mexican and Central and South American Telegraph Companies would be incomplete without a reference to Count Ferdinand de Lesseps.

In the spring of 1880, Count de Lesseps visited New York on his way to the Isthmus of Panama, his first visit there. It was a delight and a privilege to meet the Count, which I frequently did, while he was in New York. His enthusiasm and determination were contagious.

I find in my old files a copy of a letter which I wrote to the Count and his reply, wherein reference is also made to a projected line across the Pacific Ocean. These two letters follow:

MEXICAN TELEGRAPH COMPANY,
NEW YORK, March 30, 1880.

COUNT FERDINAND DE LESSEPS,
Windsor Hotel, New York.

DEAR SIR:

I enclose for your examination the map and prospectus of the Mexican Telegraph Company; also a Telegraphic Chart of the World.

You will note that the route of the Mexican Telegraph Company furnishes the telegraphic link necessary to connect South and Central America with the United States and Europe.

You will also observe that the projected line across the Pacific Ocean from the coast of Central America to New Zealand, Australia, China and Japan will insure a direct and certain route to the East. Despatches will then be forwarded in one language, avoiding the mistakes and delays occurring on the route *via* Russia, Turkey, Persia and India, besides securing for the \$50,000,000 of capital invested in the North Atlantic cables, the European and American traffic to and from the East which now goes *via* Russia, and the Asiatic countries.

It is now too late to discuss the abstract question of the usefulness of the telegraph. It would be as easy now to dispense with the steam engine on land as to forego the use of the submarine cable across the seas. I feel assured that this cable now submitted to your clear appreciation will become one of the most important

auxiliaries of your great undertaking, the Panama Canal, even during its construction.

I remain, dear sir,

Yours respectfully,

JAMES A. SCRYMSER,
President.

NEW YORK, March 31, 1880.

JAMES A. SCRYMSER, Esq.

President, Mexican Telegraph Company,
New York.

DEAR SIR:

I thank you for the interesting details you give me relative to the telegraphic communication established, and to be established, between the American continent and the rest of the world.

I am particularly struck with the advantages that will result from placing Japan, China, Australia, etc., etc., in telegraphic communication with the United States and Europe, by connecting the end of your projected Central American cables with the telegraphic system of New Zealand and Australia.

The submarine lines now connecting Europe with America will gain enormously thereby, on account of the rapidity and uniformity of messages to and from those far off countries, messages which are now transmitted by the complicated and uncertain way of Russia and the Asiatic countries.

Central America is on the eve of witnessing great events, notably, the cutting of the Isthmus of Panama, which will give those regions an incalculable importance and will cause your system of submarine lines in the Pacific to become indispensable.

Your American spirit of enterprise reverses the established order of things; henceforth to communicate from Europe eastward we will have to go West.

Accept with my thanks my most sincere wishes for the success of your important undertaking, in which you are so well seconded by your worthy Vice-President, Mr. de Sabla, my friend and co-laborer in the great work of the Panama Canal.

Yours very truly,

FERD. DE LESSEPS.

One of Count de Lesseps prominent associates was Bonaparte Wyse, who, with his wife, visited New York a year before the Count's visit. Mr. Wyse possessed also a most inspiring enthusiasm in his faith in the Panama Canal project. It was Mr. Wyse who obtained the original concession from the United States of



COUNT FERDINAND DE LESSEPS

Colombia, under which the de Lesseps Company was formed and exploited.

Another prominent worker with Count de Lesseps was my cable associate, Theodore J. de Sabla. He was most active in the Canal project and his large acquaintance in the United States of Colombia proved most useful to de Lesseps and Wyse in securing the necessary concessions and in developing the plans which were finally adopted by the de Lesseps Company.

The completion of the Panama Canal by the United States Government recalls those early days and the faith in the undertaking displayed by Count de Lesseps and others.

Value of American-Owned Cables to the American Government and Necessity of Governmental Jurisdiction

THE great European War has taught the nations the immense value of strategic cables. For years Great Britain, France and Germany have been diligently engaged in establishing cable communication entirely independent of each other. English, French and German Cable Companies have been heavily subsidized by their respective Governments. Complete control of cable communication is most desirable in times of peace and it is most essential in times of war, for it then guarantees to a Government a means of communication with its navy and its ministers abroad which, because of strict neutrality laws, the Government would not enjoy if forced to depend upon a foreign cable system.

For years I have been endeavoring to impress upon the United States Government the vital importance of such control. Its importance was many times exemplified in our war with Spain.

The Mexican Telegraph Company and the Central and South American Telegraph Company, comprising altogether a system of nearly seventeen thousand miles and connecting Washington, telegraphically, with Mexico and all of the Central and South American Republics, have given to the Government, gratuitously, an all-American cable system, the value of which is inestimable.

I say "gratuitously," for the United States Government has never contributed one cent to the establishment of this great system to the South of us.

The origin of these two Companies has already been alluded to, but it is an interesting fact worth recording that they grew out of a monopoly which was granted by the United States Congress in 1865 to the International Ocean Telegraph Company. Little was it dreamed at that time that the sole right for 14 years then granted was destined to be the foundation stone of

an all-American cable system with Mexico, Central and South America.

Although neither Company has ever received a subsidy from the United States Government, I feel that here I should record my sincere appreciation of the assistance which we have received, diplomatically, from the following Secretaries of State, *viz.*, William H. Seward, Thomas F. Bayard, James G. Blaine, Frederick T. Frelinghuysen, John Hay, Elihu Root, Philander C. Knox and William Jennings Bryan, and from the present Assistant Secretary of State, Robert Lansing. All of these distinguished officials have been far-seeing enough to recognize the political and commercial value of an independent American cable communication and have ably assisted in the establishment and extension of the system.

It is regrettable, however, that other high officials of the United States Government have blindly opposed the extension of the cables of our two Companies and have been the means of withholding the governmental support to which the Companies were entitled, in their endeavor to strengthen an all-American cable system. In some quarters, in recent years, it has been considered unwise (politically) to aid "corporations" and to give them the encouragement, support and protection to which they are entitled.

It is well, occasionally, to ponder upon the fact that if it had not been for the prompt and wise action of Secretary Seward, in 1865, the present system to which I have referred (connecting United States with Mexico, Central and South America) might to-day be in foreign hands and, in case of war, our Government, if so engaged, would suffer very considerably.

Our absolute unpreparedness at the time of the war with Spain was pitiable, although our sins of omission were ultimately forgotten in the victory of the United States.

The purpose of this article is to emphasize the value of American-owned cables and a brief history of our cable troubles both in Cuba and in Manila, during the Spanish war, will not, I am sure, be amiss.

When war was declared, our Government and its officers were wholly unprepared to arrange for telegraphic communica-

tion with the island of Cuba, where, it was expected, our Army would land, at either Matanzas or Santiago. There was not a cable repair ship in the United States service, and no materials whatsoever for picking up or laying cables, were available.

After the declaration of war, in the Spring of 1898, I received a wire from Washington asking me to make an appointment for the next morning at 8.00 o'clock with a high Government officer, who wished to see me on important official business. The appointment was made, and at the hour named the proposed conference took place. I found the high official very much excited. He told me that the Army was about to be dispatched from Florida to Santiago and that the President had no means of communicating with it when it reached there. He confided to me that the Government had thought of the possibility of using the British cable, running from Colon, on the Isthmus of Panama, to Santiago, *via* Jamaica, in connection with the lines of the Central and South American Telegraph Company, then running from New York to Colon, *via* Galveston.

"In this emergency," said my distinguished visitor, "the Government has given me authority to purchase the British cable outright." I listened until he had fully outlined the Government's plans and then was obliged to point out to him the fact that inasmuch as the cable in question was a British-owned cable, it would be a distinct violation of neutrality for the United States Government to make use of it, even should the Government buy every share of the British Cable Company. "Spain," I said, "would protest at once and the English Government must, by the rule of nations, prohibit either its purchase or its use by the American Government. And, if it were possible for our Government to purchase the said cable," I remarked, "the cable would be of no use unless it were picked up off Santiago and landed on the coast of Cuba under cover of our guns."

My visitor saw the truth of this contention and, in desperation, asked me if I could not solve the problem.

It so happened that at the time there was one other cable to Cuba, a subsidized French-owned cable, part of a system which bound North and South America to France. This particular section ran from New York to Santiago, *via* Hayti. Everybody

recognized that it was a part of the French system and it seemed to be as impossible to use it as the English cable, which I have mentioned.

I was well acquainted with the history of this French-owned cable and had in my desk, at the time, a printed copy of the legal proceedings in a United States Government suit against the French Company. The policy of the United States Government, respecting the landing of foreign cables, required that reciprocal rights should be granted to American Companies and, inasmuch as the French Company held exclusive rights in the West Indies, President Cleveland had instructed the Attorney-General to bring suit to enjoin the landing of that cable on the shores of the United States. The Hon. Elihu Root represented the United States in this suit and was amazed when representatives of the Postal Telegraph Company presented an affidavit to the Court showing that ownership of the French cable, between New York and Santiago, had been transferred to an American Company. Now, this Company was a dummy, purely invented to get around the United States injunction. It was called the United States and Hayti Cable Company, and incorporated under the laws of West Virginia. All that this Company actually did was to lay about ten miles of cable from Coney Island through the inshore waters of the United States to the high seas and, yet, it solemnly submitted an affidavit which said:

That it was really the owner of the cable now being laid from New York City to Hayti; that it was the Company's intention to control and operate such cable and all the parts thereof; that it had no connection whatsoever with the French Cable Company; and that it was its intention to continue to own, operate and control the proposed cable.

As a result of this affidavit, the Court was forced to decide the suit in favor of the Company. Little did the "United States and Hayti Cable Company" ever dream that their affidavit was to be of distinct service to the United States Government!

I explained to the officer, with whom I was conferring, the full history of this French Company and, in response to his request for a solution of the problem which confronted Washington, I advised him that the United States Government should

immediately seize the New York-Hayti-Santiago cable, and this the Government did without delay. As soon as the fact of the seizure was learned, the French Ambassador called at the State Department to protest against the seizure of "the French cable," but when the Ambassador was shown a copy of the affidavit of his "French Company" he had nothing more to say.

With the seizure of this cable, communication with our army in Cuba was possible, provided the United States Government could obtain possession of the cable at the Cuban end. The Cuban end landed in Santiago, and Santiago was under the control of the Spanish Government. It was necessary, therefore, to pick up that end, and this was done a few miles east of Santiago. On the very day our Army landed, the cable was brought ashore and direct communication between Shafter's headquarters and the War Department in Washington was established. The steamer "*Adria*" was converted into a cable ship, the cable machinery and all the necessary equipment, including buoys, tackle and testing apparatus, was supplied by the Mexican Telegraph Company, and the whole expedition was planned in its New York office. The picking up of the cable and the relaying was no easy job. Much of the work was done under fire, with soldiers for cable hands. Lieut. Maturin L. Hellings, previously the Company's engineer for many years, personally took charge of the work. He received the rank of Lieutenant in the Signal Corps, in order that he might have authority over the soldiers and might not be interfered with. I am sure that it will be of interest if I quote some extracts from a letter received from Mr. Hellings. He says:

As the "*Adria*" is now nearing Tortugas, for fumigation, and the expedition, apparently, about over, I will give you a synopsis of adventures since leaving Key West, May 29th.

Owing to the nature of the work required, *i. e.*, cutting cables under fire, I found it impossible to persuade any of my experienced cable hands to go with me, hence was supplied with ten soldiers from the First Artillery, U. S. A.

Well, after a good deal of work, I succeeded in cutting two cables near the Santiago entrance in about 900 fathoms of water, when Captain Rasmussen and his crew struck, claiming he could not risk the lives of his men or injury to his ship any longer. After losing about a week on this account, we went to Guantanamo Bay

and arranged to repair the Guantanamo-Haiti and the Guantanamo-Santiago sections, which, under many trying difficulties, was accomplished in depths varying from 30 to 800 fathoms.

After this I was instructed to pick up the Guantanamo-Santiago section, just outside of its western landing place, Aguadores, which was in possession of the enemy and splice on to the cable aboard and run it in Saboney, six miles east of Aguadores, which was done. And then the order came to lay a new cable from Diquiri to Guantanamo, which was the worst of all! But after a great deal of hard work and kinking of cable in hold, about every ten minutes, I succeeded in laying about 45 miles of cable in 108 hours. Did you ever hear of anything to beat that?

The cable connection with Cuba was of inestimable value to our Government. At one critical time, General Shafter telegraphed President McKinley that he proposed to fall back six miles in order to reach his supplies. On receipt of this telegram, the President, himself a veteran of the Civil War, realizing how such a retreat in the face of the enemy would demoralize the Army, ordered General Shafter to hold every inch of ground and not to fall back until he had orders to do so. Shortly after this the Spanish Army surrendered.

It will also be recalled that Col. Roosevelt and others cabled to Washington protesting because of the detention of the army in Cuba when, owing to sickness, it was rapidly disintegrating. The cable here again played an important part for, within a few hours, it was arranged to withdraw the Army from Cuba. Thus it was saved from serious loss through yellow fever.

The cable played a most important part later at Manila. There was a cable from Hong Kong to Manila and a short extension from Manila to Cavite, on the Island of Luzon. Profiting by our experience in Cuba, Commodore Dewey had strict orders from Washington to see that the Spaniards were prevented from using the Hong Kong-Manila cable, about 950 miles in length. When Dewey reached Manila, he promptly fished for the cable and the "fishing expedition" was apparently successful, for Dewey telegraphed to Washington that he had seized the cable and had it lashed to the stern of his ship.

Shortly afterwards, I received a confidential wire from my manager in Galveston to the effect that a cable message, addressed to Valparaiso, Chile, had passed through the Galveston office, containing instructions for the fitting out of a privateer to attack American vessels. The message came from Manila and proved conclusively that there was still cable communication with that place.

As soon as I received the manager's telegram I communicated with Washington and was asked to come down at once and explain all that I knew of the matter and the cable situation generally. I took the earliest train possible and hastened to the Navy Department. There they were most anxious to know whether I could explain the mystery—how a cablegram had come through from Manila when Washington had already received word from Dewey that he had seized the cable and lashed the same to his whip? I told them that the explanation was simple and that Commodore Dewey had picked up, by mistake, the little branch cable to Cavite, instead of the Manila-Hong Kong cable.

The Washington officials were astounded and likewise in a quandary. The lack of knowledge of the entire situation, which existed in Washington, was lamentable. The first question to be decided was, of course, how to get word to Dewey, telling him of his mistake. It would take a week or more to reach him, and within that time the Spaniards could do a great deal of mischief with the cable. When my advice was asked, I suggested that the simplest and surest way was to officially protest to Great Britain against this violation of neutrality on the part of Spain and this Washington did at once. Within forty-eight hours the seals of Her Britannic Majesty's Government were placed on the Hong Kong end of the cable and the danger of Spanish communication with the world was stopped.

This action was all very well—so far as Spain was concerned—but it did not settle the question as to how Commodore Dewey was going to get in telegraphic communication with Washington. Commodore Dewey at first used a despatch boat between Manila and Hong Kong, but it took the good part of a week to send messages. It was of vital importance that telegraphic communication with our naval forces in the Philippines should be estab-

lished, but how this could be accomplished the Government authorities at Washington could not see.

At a conference with President McKinley, I suggested a solution of the difficulty, *viz.*, to have the Government anchor a junk or hulk on the high seas off Hong Kong and use that as a terminal station for a cable to be laid from Manila. From this station a despatch boat could take the messages to the office in Hong Kong and, thus, no neutrality would be violated and messages to Washington could be transmitted inside of a few hours instead of a week.

My suggestion was referred to the War Department. That Department thought the proposition a good one, and it was finally taken up by the President and the Cabinet. While the latter were considering the matter favorably, the question came up as to how the Government was to purchase the cable itself. "How much would such a cable cost?" I was asked. "One million dollars," I said.

Then they informed me that there were no funds out of which this could be used and that, in consequence, it would require a special act of Congress to get the money. One of the Senators present promised to get the required special appropriation from Congress within forty-eight hours, but I pointed out that any such method of getting the money would be impracticable, for the reason that the cable would have to be made in England and the old question of neutrality would come up. I explained that England could not allow any cable to be made in her territory for such a purpose and that if the scheme became a matter of public record, in the Congressional proceedings, Spain would surely hear of it and protest. I showed them that the only practicable way to accomplish their purpose was to order the cable for a private company in South America and then have that Company transfer it to the Government. In this way, I pointed out, it would not be a very difficult matter to make sure that the cable would eventually find its way to Manila. The only obstacle, I said, was the matter of paying for the cable, and suggested that this would have to be done through some channels and from some fund not connected with the Government. To find such a means was the dilemma.

In this emergency I turned to the telephone and called up J. Pierpont Morgan and put the whole proposition up to him. Mr. Morgan asked how much it would cost, and I told him one million dollars. Without a moment's hesitation, his answer came back: "Tell Mr. Long, the Secretary of the Navy, he can draw on me for the whole amount provided you will take full charge of the project."

As a matter of fact, the Government never had to avail itself of Mr. Morgan's offer. The situation at Manila changed. In July came the battle of Santiago, which ended the war, and the cable was never laid.

I consider that these two experiences of our Government, when at war with Spain, are very live examples of the value of all-American cables.

In relation to the Manila cable, I feel that the following letters from the Navy and War Departments should be inserted, as a matter of record:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
WASHINGTON, June 3, 1898.

SIR:

In the temporary absence of the Secretary from the Department, I have sent your telegram directly to the President, so that it could be considered immediately.

In this connection, permit me to confirm our telephone conversation of some days ago, extending to you the thanks of the Department for the valuable suggestions from you from time to time with respect to the Manila cable, and also, through you, its appreciation of the very generous offer of Mr. Morgan in the same connection.

I have the honor to be,

Very respectfully,

CHARLES H. ALLEN,
Assistant Secretary.

MR. JAMES A. SCRYSER,
Pres. Central and South American Telegraph Co.,
New York City.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
SIGNAL OFFICE,
WASHINGTON, June 23, 1898.

MY DEAR MR. SCRYMSER:

I am sorry to say that nothing has been done either regarding the Manila cable or the cable ship purchase. I have quite worn myself out in this line, but so far without avail.

I am sure that the people of the United States owe you thanks for the energy and professional ability which you have so freely contributed to the solution of this question.

I am very much crowded, but hope to have an easier time of it, during the coming week.

Yours truly,

A. W. GREELEY,
Chief Signal Officer.

MR. JAMES A. SCRYMSER, *President,*
New York City.

Wireless Telegraphy

ATTENTION has already been called to the urgent and vital necessity of governmental control over cable communication in times of war and, of course, this applies with equal force to governmental jurisdiction over the wireless systems on our shores.

Some years ago the *Telegraph Age* published an interview with me on this subject. In the interview, I pointed out that our American Government officials had, seemingly, failed to realize that, in the event of a foreign war, the enemy's fleet could, when still a thousand miles off shore, locate every one of our war vessels, and, furthermore, ascertain the defensive position of every seaport, through the use of wireless telegraphy.

I explained the importance which the Hon. William H. Seward, Secretary of State, under President Lincoln, attached to what is known as the "Marine League," the three-mile limit off shore which in effect prohibits foreigners from erecting a battery within three miles of the upland. Secretary Seward maintained that a cable, being silent and secret in its operation, was many times more dangerous than the battery of an enemy.

I also called attention to the fact that the Hon. Hamilton Fish, Secretary of State under President Grant, in 1869, threatened to send a naval vessel to Duxbury, Mass., with order to tear up the French cable, if landed without his permission, and that not until the exclusive features of the French Company's Concessions were eliminated and full reciprocal rights were granted to American Companies to land cables on the coast of France, was this permission given.

Further, I emphasized the very important fact that if an American should attempt to build a wireless system in England, France or Germany, he would immediately be seized as a spy and treated as a spy, while in this country, German wireless sys-

tems have been built and operated without licenses, in some cases, according to the statements of the press.

My interview was called to the attention of the Department of Commerce and Labor, and that Department immediately asked me for further particulars in regard to governmental jurisdiction over wireless systems and, particularly, in regard to the reciprocal policy insisted upon by Secretary of State Fish. Upon receipt of the information asked for, the Department of Commerce and Labor referred the entire matter to the Attorney-General, Hon. George W. Wickersham, for his opinion.

On November 22, 1912, Mr. Wickersham rendered an elaborate opinion. He quoted very fully from the Acts of Congress, having for their object the regulation and control of wireless telegraphy by means of fines, these fines being levied upon all plants installed without a proper license from the Government, the penalty for each offense being a fine of \$500.

In reply to the points raised by me, Mr. Wickersham ruled that inasmuch as the Congress of the United States had failed to pass a law requiring reciprocal conditions for the landing of cables there was no authority for the United States Government to demand reciprocal wireless rights.

It is apparent that Mr. Wickersham's opinion on this reciprocal policy differs very widely from the opinion held by two of our greatest Secretaries of State, Mr. Seward and Mr. Fish, both of whom held that the three-mile limit off shore was sufficient justification for any action which vitally involved the protection and defense of our country.

The principle of national protection involved in what is known as the "Marine League" is, to my mind, both wise and logical, and I hold that this principle is violated wherever and whenever a foreign wireless telegraph message passes over the three-mile limit to or from any point in the United States, by means of a foreign-owned company operating without a license. The transmission of such wireless telegraph messages, silent and secret as they are, should certainly be under the sole control of the United States Government, both in times of peace and in times of war.

Attorney-General Wickersham's quotations from the Acts of Congress, attempting to regulate and control wireless telegraphy, were interesting. His opinion was rendered in 1912 during the Taft administration and yet we have learned from the press only recently (as I have mentioned) that some wireless organizations have not been licensed as the law requires, and we have learned, too, that several private wireless installations are likewise being operated without licenses.

Attorney-General Wickersham calls attention to the fact that under the laws all licenses are *revocable* and that, when issued, they shall specify the ownership and location of each station and, further, that they shall be issued only to citizens of the United States. Despite these regulations, it is a well known fact that a number of wireless systems are German-owned, although ostensibly transferred to American corporations. Such questionable actions should be investigated and, if the information proves true, the licenses should be revoked in each case.

We have but recently seen that a German-owned wireless company attempted to enjoin the United States of America from interfering with its operations. Such audacious action of a foreign-owned company would have been promptly resented in the days of Secretary Seward and Secretary Fish.

In President Wilson's message to Congress, December 8, 1914, he says:

We have not been negligent of national defense. We are not unmindful of the great responsibility resting upon us. We shall learn and profit by the lesson of every experience and every new circumstance, and what is needed will be adequately done.

As one humble American citizen, I am wondering why the Government in Washington has not exercised a proper control over wireless telegraphy and why the Government did not at once revoke the license of the foreign wireless company when it attempted to dispute its authority, as undoubtedly Secretaries Seward and Fish would have done.

In the opinion of Attorney-General Wickersham, it would appear that Secretary Fish should have had a specific Act of Congress to justify his drastic treatment of the French Company in 1869! Acts of Congress to suit every case are not kept "on

tap" and I have never known of any one excepting Mr. Wickersham, to dispute the reciprocal policy, inaugurated by President Grant and supported by Secretary Fish. Mr. Wickersham has evidently overlooked the fact that the Monroe Doctrine has never materialized into any formal action by Congress and, yet, the Monroe Doctrine seems to hold quite an important place in the foreign policy of these United States.

The invasion in this country by foreign telegraph companies, under existing conditions, will certainly lead to trouble in the future and the present administration would do well to seriously ponder on the subject of reciprocity as upheld by General Grant.

Landing of Original French Cable Company

REFERENCE has been made several times to the reciprocal policy of the United States Government in regard to the landing of foreign cables on our shores. In my article on "Wireless Telegraphy," I have referred to the landing of the French cable at Duxbury in 1869. The story of Baron Emil Erlanger, of Paris, who promoted this French Atlantic cable, may be of interest.

The Baron had obtained from the Emperor, Louis Napoleon III, an exclusive right for fifty years for landing his cable on the coast of France, and journeyed to America to make the necessary landing arrangements at this end. The Baron was a Confederate Government Agent during our Civil War, and was chiefly remembered in this country as the promoter of the Confederate Government Cotton Loan.

The French cable scheme was bitterly opposed, from the start, by Cyrus W. Field, the promoter of the Anglo-American Cable Company. Mr. Field's first step was to induce General Grant, then President of the United States, to officially notify the Emperor of France that the French cable could not be landed on American shores unless reciprocal rights were granted to an American Company for French territory. In consequence, the exclusive feature of Baron Erlanger's French Concession was canceled and the Baron probably concluded that he would have no further trouble in landing his cable at the place planned, Duxbury, on Cape Cod. Mr. Field, however, found a new obstacle to place in the Baron's way, *viz.*, the formal authority of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Somehow the Massachusetts legislators had not forgotten the services of Baron Erlanger when acting as Confederate Government Agent for its Cotton Loan and here was an excellent method to punish him, and punish him they did, by refusing to grant the necessary permission to land his cable at Duxbury. The legislators themselves were ably aided in this fight against

Baron Erlanger by numerous lawyers and lobbyists, who were engaged day and night in the endeavor to block the Baron's scheme.

In the "opposition," also, were the Western Union Telegraph Company and the Franklin Telegraph Company, both of which coveted the landline tolls on messages to and from Europe over the French Cable Company, should it succeed in securing the necessary landing rights.

It was an anxious time for the Baron, and his associates. Already nearly \$4,000,000 had been expended for the cable. The cable ship had cleared from a European port, destined for Duxbury, Mass. In desperation, Baron Erlanger's agent came to me and gave me to understand that, although he had spent thousands of dollars in lawyers' fees and otherwise, he could make no headway whatsoever with the Legislature of Massachusetts. He told me that the cable ship was about due at Duxbury, and would have to pay a demurrage of \$2,000 per day unless the landing rights could be secured at once.

Naturally, I was most anxious that the French Company should succeed in securing the landing rights and, so, be in a position to compete with the Anglo-American Cable Company, which was charging at that time about one dollar a word on all European messages. A reduction of this rate would, of course, increase the traffic of the International Ocean Telegraph Company, with which I was then connected, to and from Cuba and the other West India Islands. For this reason I planned to secure the necessary State landing rights for the French Company. I asked the agent what he could afford to pay to secure the permission within one week. He replied that he would willingly pay \$10,000. I well knew that he would gladly pay more, but I was so anxious that his Company should succeed at once, I promised to obtain for him the necessary authority.


There were two men in the State of New Jersey whom I knew I could rely upon. I arranged to meet them in Trenton on a Friday morning and agreed to pay them the \$10,000 provided they could quickly and quietly secure the passage of a Bill authorizing the landing of the French cable on the coast of New Jersey within one week. At noon, the following Tues-

day, I received a telegram informing me of the successful passage of the necessary Bill and that it had been signed by the Governor.

My plan was eminently successful and the anticipated sensation in the ranks of the lobbyists in the Massachusetts Legislature and the Western Union and Franklin Telegraph Companies was quickly forthcoming. The lobbyists knew that their long fight was in vain if the French Company could land on the coast of New Jersey and the Telegraph Companies foresaw that the French Cable Company might build its own landlines to New York City and so save all the landline tolls between Duxbury and New York. To me, it was as good as a comic play to behold the disappointment of the lawyers and lobbyists when they found that they had been outflanked, and the fact that they were eventually obliged to aid, rather than oppose, the cable landing of the French cable on the coast of Massachusetts did not add to their joy.

The Bill, granting permission to land the cable on New Jersey soil, was most effective and, finally, the French Cable Company received the permission to land at Duxbury, Mass., without the slightest opposition.

It is interesting to note, also, that within a month the Atlantic cable tariff was reduced from one dollar a word to about twenty-five cents and the reduction proved highly beneficial to our Cuba and West India traffic.



To my friend, Mr. James A. Squire,
who, at the critical moment, was a-
ble to give to the political revolution
of 1892-4 the impetus essential to its
ultimate success.

C. H. Parkhurst.

"Lest We Forget"

The Parkhurst Campaign

OVER twenty years have elapsed since the Rev. Dr. Charles H. Parkhurst, almost alone, achieved his marvelous victory over Tammany Hall, in strenuous opposition to the police and the entire officialdom of New York City.

At this later day it is both interesting and instructive to look back at the fight, then waged, and to contemplate the immeasurable influence which Dr. Parkhurst's victory has had upon the political affairs of this city.

Dr. Parkhurst has been so persistently denounced and misrepresented by the press and city officials ever since his memorable campaign, that we find that the present generation has inherited the cynicism, opposition and vindictiveness toward him, which prevailed from the beginning of his fight against Tammany Hall, in 1892. Since that fight, over twenty years ago, the people have won some notable victories—the elections of Mayor Strong and Mayor Low, the Fusion victory in 1909, and, also, in 1913. These victories are, I think, traceable in a very large measure to Dr. Parkhurst. Certainly the previous twenty years, before the Parkhurst campaign, had nothing to show but a continuous Tammany control.

Dr. Parkhurst was the means of awakening New York City to a very realizing sense of its own unworthiness and the City to-day can "take its hat off" to Charles H. Parkhurst for the revival of our public conscience and the many steps which have been made toward good government.

If we go back forty years we find that prominent and respected citizens openly endorsed Tammany, under the leadership of Boss Tweed and later Boss Croker. Prominent citizens were

then too timid to lend their names to any public opposition to Tammany Hall. After Dr. Parkhurst's campaign, this timidity was a thing of the past, as will be readily seen by a perusal of the splendid Memorial signed by so many of our well known citizens, here quoted in full:

NEW YORK, November, 1894.

TO REV. CHARLES H. PARKHURST, D.D.

NEW YORK CITY.

REVEREND AND DEAR SIR:

Your fellow citizens of New York, united in a common aim to achieve and to preserve municipal integrity and manly uprightness in the discharge of public trusts, are deeply sensible of the debt of gratitude due to you for your three years campaign of disinterested and heroic effort to ensure Reform in our City Government.

The impressive popular response shown by the results of the November elections is a direct and noble plaudit, doubtless more gratifying to you than any other reward. But we, as a Committee of your fellow citizens at large and irrespective of all dividing lines, would gladly add some special testimonial to your moral leadership, in this great crusade for Municipal Reform; and we would heartily welcome an indication from yourself as to the most acceptable form of such testimonial.

Henry C. Potter
David H. Greer
Charles Lanier
Robert S. Minturn
Joseph H. Choate
Joel B. Erhardt
Abram S. Hewitt
Jos. Larocque
Charles C. Beaman
C. Vanderbilt
Chas. Stewart Smith
LeG. B. Cannon
Horace White
A. S. Frissell
Morris K. Jesup
James T. Kilbreth
James A. Garland
Horace Porter
R. Fulton Cutting
J. Augustus Johnson
Edward D. Adams

J. Pierpont Morgan
James C. Carter
Wheeler H. Peckham
Wm. L. Strong
Cornelius N. Bliss
John S. Kennedy
Isaac N. Seligman
James H. Dunham
J. Gaillard Thomas
John A. Stewart
John Sloane
Anson Phelps Stokes
Jno. E. Parsons
Chas. H. Godfrey
Cleveland H. Dodge
H. C. Fahnestock
J. Kennedy Tod
James Speyer
Jacob H. Schiff
Gustav H. Schwab
Seth Low

Wm. Nelson Cromwell
Geo. F. Baker
William H. Pell
Charles S. Fairchild
R. W. Gilder
Saml. C. Blackwell
George A. Morrison
William A. Wheelock
John W. Goff

Edw. King
Wm. B. Hornblower
Everett P. Wheeler
George Bliss
Stephen H. Olin
John Claflin
E. L. Godkin
John A. Sleicher
James A. Scrymser

The foregoing testimonial would not be complete without the publication, also, of the letter received from President Cleveland, as follows:

EXECUTIVE MANSION
WASHINGTON

Dec. 2, 1894.

JAMES A. SCRYMSER, ESQ.,

MY DEAR SIR:

At the request of Bishop Potter I enclose to you a copy of a paper addressed to Doctor Parkhurst, which he sent me for my signature.

The man whom you propose to honor is a grand citizen and deserves all his fellow townsmen can do for him and yet I do not think I ought to sign the paper I return to you.

I am not a citizen of New York and I am peculiarly situated here.

Hoping that you will believe that my declination to join you in this movement is solely based upon considerations entirely justifiable, I am,

Yours very sincerely,

GROVER CLEVELAND.

From all of these supporters it will be seen that Dr. Parkhurst's splendid work was appreciated, and it is clear that the result of his work still lives and that no amount of sneering at Dr. Parkhurst and his methods will, or can, destroy its value.

I wish that all who are interested in the welfare of New York City could read Dr. Parkhurst's own relation of his campaign, entitled "Our Fight with Tammany," published by Charles Scribner's Sons in 1895. I have neither the time nor the space to quote from the book, but, as a warning to my fellow citizens, I want to call attention to the fact that Dr. Parkhurst tells us that the whole campaign slumped just as soon as the election was over,

hence my heading of this article: "LEST WE FORGET." We are so apt to forget that "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

We all recall the fight that was made for a single-headed police commission as against the old method—two "Republicans" (?) and two "Democrats" (?) a so-called "Bi-partisan" board. It has taken nearly twenty years to secure a single-headed police control and this, again, is largely due to Dr. Parkhurst. Furthermore, it can be reasonably claimed that the affairs of New York City are to-day infinitely better conducted than they were previously, under Tammany Hall.

I will here explain the active part Mr. J. Langdon Erving took in the Parkhurst campaign. Mr. Erving was associated with me in business for over twenty years. He consulted with me very fully before offering his services to Dr. Parkhurst. Of course, we both foresaw something of the tremendous sacrifice and the abhorrent notoriety which would result, but, on the other hand, we realized the vital necessity for a man of the type of Mr. Erving, if Dr. Parkhurst were to accomplish the upheaval at which he aimed. The testimony of a man of unimpeachable integrity and character was invaluable, a life-long New Yorker, a New Yorker for generations back, a man of refinement and a gentleman—such a man was Mr. Erving, and his testimony was bound to succeed in the end, where the testimony of some paid detective would have had little, if any, effect upon the Court and Jury.

Let me quote what Dr. Parkhurst has to say about Mr. Erving:

On page 54 of Dr. Parkhurst's book, is the following tribute:

I was called upon one evening, early in March, '92, by a young man who had recently become a member of my congregation, and whom I had noticed in the church, but whom I had never personally met. Whether he had divined what was in my mind, I do not know to this day, but he said that he had come to tell me that if there was anything he could do to assist me in the enterprise recently undertaken, he was unreservedly at my service. My good friend John Langdon Erving little realized all that was involved in his noble offer, or all that it was going to cause him in the way of criticism and obloquy before his heroic service was completed; but suffice it to say that his offer of assistance was accepted and a general plan of operations outlined that same evening. I cannot let this opportunity pass

of rendering to my friend Erving the tribute of my gratitude. If in connection with this whole warfare there have been words of invective and insinuations too dastardly and devilish to be forgiven, either in this world or the world to come, they were words that were spoken upon Erving. His was the manly stuff, however, that took no detriment from calumny, and I can speak no larger word of him than to say that without him, or a man as strong and noble-spirited as he, the efforts initiated in the spring of '92, must have issued in failure.

I am sure that I shall not be misunderstood, nor criticized, if I make a personal reference to the humble part which I had the privilege of playing in that memorable campaign.

My part had its beginning on a Monday morning in June, 1892. Mr. Erving had returned to my house from the Court on the Saturday previous, in a very discouraged state of mind. On Sunday he complained of illness, so I saw but little of him. On Monday morning my butler reported that Mr. Erving was seriously ill in his bedroom and apparently wandering in his mind, exclaiming from time to time that "the people will not believe us." Upon learning of this, I went to Mr. Erving's room and found that his condition was as my butler had represented.

At about nine o'clock Dr. Parkhurst called at my home. Neither Mrs. Scrymser nor I had ever met him. Dr. Parkhurst was shown into the library where Mrs. Scrymser and I were seated and I shall never forget his anxious and troubled look. He said that he had come to inquire for his friend, Mr. Erving, and Mrs. Scrymser told him that Mr. Erving was seriously ill upstairs. Mrs. Scrymser added that she thought his illness was due wholly to the attitude of the press, which had made it appear as if Dr. Parkhurst and Mr. Erving were on trial rather than the criminals whom their affidavits had implicated.

Upon hearing of Mr. Erving's illness, Dr. Parkhurst sank into a chair, much overcome. After a pause, Mrs. Scrymser said, "Doctor, two-thirds of the people of New York really do think that you and Mr. Erving are on trial. What can we do to help you?" "Anything that you can do will be most heartily appreciated; I feel as if the earth was slipping from under my feet," replied Dr. Parkhurst.

After a few more words of conversation, Mrs. Scrymser and I

started our campaign. Within an hour, Mrs. Scrymser had engaged Cooper Institute for a public meeting the following Monday night, and had also enlisted the interest of the "Woman's Municipal League." The co-operation and active work of this League, comprising some six hundred influential women, was most effective.

I went immediately to the office of *The Mail and Express*, where I saw its proprietor, Elliott F. Shepard. I had arrived just in time: Mr. Shepard was leaving at noon for the far west. He was most responsive to my appeal and straightway called in his editor, John A. Sleicher, and instructed him to publish anything that I desired. I at once assisted in dictating an editorial for that afternoon's edition, using Mrs. Scrymser's remark as a text. The editorial was used and as I think it will be of interest, it is published here in full:

From *The Mail and Express*, May 11, 1892:

TO THE GOOD PEOPLE OF NEW YORK

Two-thirds of the people of this city seem to labor under the false impression that Dr. Parkhurst and Mr. Langdon Erving are on trial in our courts, instead of the keepers of disorderly houses, whom they have so courageously exposed.

The facts are these: Dr. Parkhurst preached a sermon in which he charged that District Attorney Nicoll was derelict in the prosecution of evil-doers. The charges were strong, the arraignment very severe, and under this pressure Mr. Nicoll went to the Grand Jury. That compliant body, under Mr. Nicoll's influence, undertook to reprimand Dr. Parkhurst for not producing evidence to sustain his sweeping charges. Mr. Nicoll and the blackmailers and the Grand Jury no doubt supposed this would end the matter. But it didn't.

Dr. Parkhurst is a man of convictions. He determined to secure the necessary evidence. He asked for volunteers, and Mr. Langdon Erving, equally courageous, honorable and sincere in purpose, offered his help. They sacrificed their personal comfort and fearlessly entered the abodes of vice and saw the sickening sights of sin. Their evidence was laid before the Grand Jury. It was not intended for the public eye, but for the secret session of that body. They had no thought of anything else but to meet the challenge of District Attorney Nicoll.

District Attorney Nicoll, instead of keeping the affidavits of Dr. Parkhurst and Mr. Erving secret as part of the Grand Jury room proceedings, deliberately used them in the prosecution of the keepers

of disreputable houses, thus dragging Dr. Parkhurst and his associate into Court and into public notoriety for the purpose of forever making their task so repellant and odious that no other decent and honorable men would ever again perform such a mission in the cause of justice. This publicity was not intended nor sought for by Dr. Parkhurst and Mr. Erving. It was the result of the District Attorney's action, and the inspiration of that action is far from creditable.

The courage of Dr. Parkhurst and Mr. Erving resulted in the exposure of Police Department methods, and in a general "shaking up" of officers under the pressure of public opinion. Both the courageous expositors of vice have been threatened with personal violence, but, in the face of threats and intimidation, both have insisted on fighting the battle out on the line of their convictions.

Enough has been shown to verify the charge of this paper that the police have been used for blackmailing purposes. The prosecution of one or two poor women for keeping dens of vice and their conviction is not the only result of Dr. Parkhurst's efforts. They have demonstrated that the police protect the dives and do it for pay. The Police Department is responsible for the vice and sin which abound in this city. They are the ones who are chiefly concerned in the injury of Dr. Parkhurst and Mr. Erving. The time has come for the good people of this city to hold up the hands of these two splendid Christian men. The time has come for a public meeting which will declare in a voice of thunder against the blackmailing methods of a political police organization and in favor of cleaning out the dives and the infamous resorts which threaten the morals of young and old.

Who will lead this great movement? It means the protection of our youth from defilement. It means the protection of the homes, particularly the homes of the poor, from the visits of the vile tempters. Dr. Parkhurst should not stand alone. He, with Mr. Erving's splendid assistance, has begun the noble work. Let the good people of New York take it up and finish it. It is not a work only for the rich and influential. The poor, the workingmen, the toilers all have deep interest in it. We appeal to our citizens to take up this matter vigorously, earnestly and at once. If our homes cannot be protected from pollution, if vice and sin, protected by a blackmailing police, are to control and prevail, the welfare of the people is truly in jeopardy.

This editorial was the first gun in the Parkhurst campaign.

From the office of *The Mail and Express* I went to the office of *The Evening Post*, and there had a talk with its editor, Horace White.

I explained to him the situation as clearly as I could. In

reply, Mr. White said that Mr. Godkin had recently sailed for Europe and that before he sailed it was decided that the Parkhurst movement was "too dirty" for *The Post* to publish and that in consequence it was thought best to drop it altogether. I told Mr. White that he was grossly mistaken and predicted that before the end of the week *The Post* would have to take back all that it had said against Dr. Parkhurst and that it would then come out squarely in his support. Mr. White replied that that was impossible.

The following Friday my prediction came true, *The Post* apologized for the mistake it had made and called upon all good citizens to support Dr. Parkhurst.

Mr. White has told me in recent years that he has thought of our interview thousands of times.

After interviewing *The Post*, I called on Mr. Howland, the Manager of *The New York Herald*. Mr. Howland explained, when I had concluded, that it was necessary to cable Mr. Bennett for his decision in the matter. I asked him when he did so to mention my name, because of the fact that my relations with Mr. Bennett, in a business way, had been quite intimate. Before the end of the week *The Herald* came into line and strongly supported Dr. Parkhurst throughout his campaign.

By the time Monday night arrived, the good element of the city was well aroused and, with the exception of the early Civil War meetings, I have never known a more enthusiastic gathering than was held that night in old Cooper Institute. That meeting will long be remembered, and I am proud to have been connected with its inception, as evidenced by the following note:

CITY VIGILANCE LEAGUE.

NEW YORK, May 19, 1892.

MR. JAMES A. SCRYMSER.

DEAR SIR:

Your check for \$———— is hereby acknowledged and on behalf of the Committee I thank you most heartily. It was at your suggestion that this meeting was called and it bids fair to prove an *overwhelming* success. The "call" has been answered by over a thousand of our most prominent citizens. Your check is the only financial assistance we have received for this purpose and I am instructed to express our gratitude accordingly.

Very truly yours,

J. N. HALLOCK,

Chairman.

As an indication of the suspicion and gross misunderstanding of the early work of Dr. Parkhurst, and his fight against the police, I might mention that during the first week I prepared a Resolution, endorsing Dr. Parkhurst's work, and submitted the same to the presiding officer of the City Club—then, as now, a powerful organization—in the hopes that it might be adopted by that Club. This presiding officer was a prominent lawyer and thoroughly in sympathy with everything which had for its object the public good in the City of New York. You may imagine my surprise at his action when the Resolution was handed to him. With an expression of thorough disgust, he read it and then held the Resolution between the tips of his fingers, at a distance, saying, "Take it away, take it away, its subject is too nasty."

I should not have told this story if there had not been another side to it. Shortly after this time, my good friend, the presiding officer of the City Club, became an ardent supporter of Dr. Parkhurst, and his name is among the distinguished names who signed the Memorial, printed on page 110.

There are any number of instances connected directly and indirectly with the Parkhurst campaign which I might relate. The lack of space, however, forbids. When the public discovered that it was a success there were many accessions to the ranks and many were anxious to "climb on the band wagon." One notable instance of this is evidenced by the following letter from Dr. Parkhurst and my reply thereto:

NO. 133 EAST 35th STREET,
NEW YORK, SEPT. 25, 1894.

JAMES A. SCRYMSEER, ESQ.,
39 Wall Street, City.

MY DEAR SIR:

This will introduce to you the bearer, my assistant, Rev. Chauncey W. Goodrich.

I will merely outline the matter upon which I am going to ask him to speak with you: I am exceedingly anxious that if possible, arrangements should be made whereby Archbishop Ireland of St. Paul can be induced to speak in this City prior to election, upon matters of municipal government. I had an interview with him last May, with this object in view; he received me not only courteously, but most kindly, and expressed himself as being in absolute sympathy with all that was being undertaken in behalf of better municipal

government. He referred to the delicacy with which any action of his would have to be taken, in view of the fact that if he spoke here he would be within the limits of another man's diocese. He nevertheless engaged to hold it as an open question and expected to hear from me again, either at the end of September, or in the beginning of October. It was his impression at that time, that if a properly worded invitation, with suitable indorsement, were sent to him, he could somehow find it in his way to accept such invitation. I have learned from him, however, within a few days, that the matter will have to be approached with somewhat more of indirection. The letter which conveys to me that information will be put in your hands by Mr. Goodrich; I submit the case in its present posture.

We cannot afford to leave any stone unturned: the Archbishop's influence is almost incalculably great; all of us, I think, who know him, or have any intelligent knowledge in regard to him, have confidence in his character, in the integrity of his purpose and in the honesty of his devotion to American institutions.

May I ask you to consider the case as it stands at present, and to express yourself with as much freedom as you will, to the bearer?

Yours very sincerely,

C. H. PARKHURST.

37 WALL STREET,
NEW YORK, Sept. 27, 1894.

REV. CHARLES H. PARKHURST,
NEW YORK.

MY DEAR SIR:

Referring to your letter of September 25th, and my conversation with the Rev. Chauncey W. Goodrich, respecting the advisability of inviting Archbishop Ireland of St. Paul to speak in this city, prior to election, upon matters of municipal government, I have to say that I do not approve of it.

I understand from Mr. Goodrich that Father Ducey is cautiously urging the issue of this invitation to Archbishop Ireland. As I view the situation in the City of New York, I believe that a large majority of the Democratic voters are Roman Catholics; certainly a very large majority of the saloon-keepers, office holders and criminals are Roman Catholics, and yet I cannot recall any time when the Roman Catholic Church, or any of its local Bishops have taken a decided stand for political reform, or even endorsed the work of reformers. I doubt very much if any prominent member of that Church approved of your efforts until recently.

It is characteristic of the inside managers of the Roman Catholic Church to put forward a prominent man when it sees a change coming. But why bring a man from Minnesota to say what New

York needs? In my judgment you will do just as good work without the assistance of that Church and its Priests, and if successful, which I believe you will be, you will not have to share the glory with those who should have aided you in the beginning.

I do not share in your high opinion of Archbishop Ireland's devotion to American institutions. The present bad condition of the Public Schools throughout the State of New York, particularly in Brooklyn, New York City and Buffalo, is largely owing to the policy set forth in Muller's Book *and endorsed by Archbishop Ireland* voluntarily.

I have thought it best to express my views in this form and so avoid any misunderstanding arising through my conversation with the Rev. Mr. Goodrich.

Yours very sincerely,

JAMES A. SCRYMSER.

I might explain that Archbishop Ireland came to New York and made a determined effort to take an active part in the Parkhurst election campaign. It was decided that he should not appear on the platform at the public meeting which was to be held in Carnegie Hall. At that meeting, President Harrison presided. Somehow, I never knew how, Archbishop Ireland managed to get a seat on the platform, uninvited, but the Chairman was warned that the program was full and, in consequence, Archbishop Ireland was not to be allowed to speak. The upper gallery was packed with a crowd of his admirers and there were loud cries for a speech from him. The Chairman, however, firmly held his ground and the Archbishop was not permitted to take part in the meeting.

This Carnegie Hall meeting immediately preceded the election at which William L. Strong was chosen Mayor of New York. After the election, I am told upon good authority, Archbishop Ireland called upon the Treasurer of the Committee of Seventy and intimated as he had come from the Far West, he considered that he was entitled to some compensation for the part he had taken in the campaign. He was told, my informant adds, that the Committee of Seventy had no knowledge of his having been retained, nor were they aware of his having contributed toward the success of the campaign in any way.

Some years after, there was a lively controversy between Archbishop Corrigan and Father Ducey, of New York. In many

respects this controversy was a sequel to Archbishop Ireland's intrusion, to which I have referred. The crux of the Corrigan-Ducey controversy, in my opinion, is in a paragraph in the letter which Father Ducey wrote to "His Excellency, the Most Rev. M. A. Corrigan, D.D., Archbishop of New York," under date of November 17, 1894 (I quote from the *New York Herald*, November 23, 1894) reading:

Had the Church, through church men, openly acted with courage in opposing corruptions and corruptors of this great city, the Catholic Church would have glory throughout the world. Now, Dr. Parkhurst has won!

The foregoing leads me to digress a little. I learned much of "politics" in those days and a story which came to me upon excellent authority, even though a digression, might here be cited. It appertains to a certain well known Archbishop from the West, who was successful in raising over \$60,000 with the assistance of a number of "good Republicans" in this State. I am told that the money was raised for the purpose of taking up the Archbishop's notes, which had been given for the purchase of certain real estate—a speculation which had involved the cleric to the extent of the money named. The story was that the "good Republicans" took over the real estate, organized a company and used the proceeds from the sale of stock to take up the notes mentioned. I have reason to believe that the subscribers to that stock have never received any dividends and I doubt very much whether the stock has any marketable value.

To return to the Parkhurst campaign, \$60,000, mentioned in my digression, seems a large amount when compared with the sum we were able to raise for a Memorial to Dr. Parkhurst. After the greatest amount of effort and backed by the best citizenship of New York, we succeeded in raising only \$28,959.57. The correspondence with Dr. Parkhurst in relation thereto will, I am sure, be found of much interest.

First, let me quote in full Dr. Parkhurst's reply to the Memorial which we sent to him (printed on page 110).

No. 133 EAST 35TH STREET,
NEW YORK, December 11, 1894.

THE RIGHT REV. HENRY C. POTTER,
J. PIERPONT MORGAN, ESQ.,
HON. JOHN W. GOFF,

and Associates.

GENTLEMEN:

You will appreciate the delicacy of the situation in which I am placed by your kind and affecting communication just received. The victory of November 6th and the love and confidence of my fellow-citizens are more than ample reward for all the services I have been able to render: Nor ought it to be forgotten that while I had a part, and a disagreeably conspicuous part, in initiating the movement in our City, it is not by my efforts, but by the efforts of great numbers working in concerted consecration of purpose, that that movement has been brought to its splendid consummation. It hardly need be said to you, therefore, that if it lies in your hearts to show, by any added means, the cordiality of your regard, such demonstration would require to take a shape that would not even be suggested of personal enrichment to myself.

If I am to answer your question as frankly as it is frankly asked, I should have to say that no action on your part would seem to me apposite which did not look in the direction of helping to establish and perpetuate the municipal results already secured. The success of November 6th needs to be made permanent. My own efforts in that direction will be put forth primarily through the agency of the City Vigilance League, an organization which has been in existence now for two years, which has established a specific basis of operation in each of the thirty Assembly Districts of the City, and considers so much municipal success as it has already helped to achieve rather the beginning than the end of its hopes. The League is mortgaged to no sect and to no school of politics: its members are not seeking office, and we are bound by the terms of our constitution to put forward no candidates for office. Our aim is to acquaint ourselves with our city, to study its needs, to publish existing abuses whatever may be the party or whoever may be the man that may be responsible for them, and to stimulate, especially among the young men, both of our native and foreign population, that understanding of municipal interests that shall help to make the municipal ballot intelligent, and that appreciation of civic duties that shall help to render the municipal ballot clean and honest. In a word, the League represents the continuance of that straight line of rectitude and individual self-regardlessness needed in order to win the victory of November, and just as much needed in order to render the fruits of that victory an abiding possession.

This League needs a local habitation, sufficiently central to be easy of access from all quarters of the town; sufficiently commodious to meet the growing requirements of its multiplying membership and enlarging interests.

The above is, of course, submitted to you only as a suggestion, to be accepted or rejected according to the promptings of your larger and your combined wisdom.

Yours very sincerely,

C. H. PARKHURST.

When the money which I have mentioned was raised, Dr. Parkhurst was formally notified in the following letter:

NEW YORK, May 3, 1895.

THE REV. CHARLES H. PARKHURST, D.D.

NEW YORK.

REVEREND AND DEAR SIR:

As members of the Advisory Committee of the Dr. Parkhurst Testimonial, we now have to inform you, in accordance with the enclosed account of J. Langdon Erving, Treasurer, that there is a balance of \$28,959.59 in his hands this day and we desire to close the account.

This sum represents the proceeds of contributions received by this committee in response to our appeal to the public of December 10, 1894, soliciting a popular tribute in recognition of your three years' previous effort for municipal reform, already approved and seconded by the phenomenal success attained in the city elections of November 6th.

We cordially appreciate your assent to such a tribute conditioned upon its taking a shape not even suggestive of personal enrichment to yourself, and intimating that it be applied to the maintenance of the City Vigilance League.

We will be glad to place in your name as trustee this tribute of our fellow citizens in order that the City Vigilance League shall be maintained in accordance with a deed of trust, subject to such precautions and limitations as in your judgment will best subserve your object—the attainment and establishment of municipal reform.

In hearty sympathy with your design,

Respectfully,

HORACE PORTER,
EDWARD KING,
CHARLES LANIER,
JAMES A. SCRYMSEER,
J. KENNEDY TOD,

Advisory Committee, Dr. Parkhurst Testimonial.

Dr. Parkhurst replied to this letter as follows:

No. 133 EAST 35TH STREET,
NEW YORK, May 20, 1895.

JAMES A. SCRYMSER, ESQ.,

General HORACE PORTER, and others.

Members of the Advisory Committee of the Dr. Parkhurst Testimonial.

GENTLEMEN:

I have the honor to acknowledge your communication of the 3rd instant and to express to you my appreciation of the service which, as an Advisory Committee, you have consented to assume in the matter of the Memorial Fund.

Permit me to convey through you to the kind donors who have made me their debtor an acknowledgment of obligation both in my own behalf and, more particularly, in behalf of the City Vigilance League and the great cause of municipal reform which that League represents. I cordially accept the trust which it is your proposition to commit to me and will discharge its responsibilities in accordance with the intention indicated by your letter and prescribed by my reply of December 11, 1894.

In my reply above referred to occurs the statement that "the League represents the continuance of that straight line of rectitude and individual self-regardlessness needed in order to win the victory of November and just as much needed in order to render the fruits of that victory an abiding possession."

A straight line is exceedingly straight. If we are quick to detect respects in which it has been deviated from, we are just as quick to recognize the forward steps that have been taken and the gain that has been made. But whatever the construction which we may put upon the present situation, it is evident that we are, as yet, only at the beginning of a long, hard, and uncompromising fight for municipal home rule and for the administration of municipal affairs by men of unimpeachable integrity, who will determine their policy by the requirements of the city and who will treat the intrusion of partisan schemes as an intolerable impertinence.

It is upon this ground that the City Vigilance League is established and along this line that it will work, and in its behalf, I repeat my expression of indebtedness to all, of whatever religious or political faith, who by their kindly and generous contributions to the Memorial Fund have helped to facilitate the work of the League and to encourage it in its pursuit of those ends so dear to the heart of every man, who loves his city for its own sake.

Yours very sincerely,

C. H. PARKHURST.

I do not think that I can close this article on Dr. Parkhurst's campaign in any better way than by copying an editorial from

The Evening Post of New York, November 10, 1894, after the election of Mayor Strong. I quote it in full:

Few people are aware (because they have short memories) how much Mr. De Lacey Nicoll has inadvertently contributed to the tremendous overthrow of Tammany.

In the month of February, 1892, the Rev. Dr. Parkhurst preached a sermon in which he said that the District Attorney was not doing his duty, that well-known violators of the law went unpunished, and that the only conceivable reason was that they had a "pull" of some kind on the public authorities. Mr. Nicoll was at this time the District Attorney. He brought Dr. Parkhurst's sermon to the attention of a Tammany grand jury, and this discerning body instead of indicting the law-breakers, sent for Dr. Parkhurst and asked him what he meant. He replied that he had spoken only from public rumor, but that he believed that what he said was true. The grand jury thereupon passed a public censure upon him, and the word was freely passed around that Dr. Parkhurst would be driven out of the city.

Being thus challenged, Dr. Parkhurst addressed himself to the task of procuring evidence that would be admissible even before a Tammany jury. His first adventure was an unsavory one, but everybody can see now that it was necessary. The facts that he and Mr. Langdon Erving were enabled to lay before the grand jury were so much worse than they had expected to find that something must needs be done by the District Attorney. A prosecution of the keepers of the disreputable houses followed, and it was made very hot for Parkhurst and Erving, who were called into court from day to day and paraded in the newspapers till it seemed to most people as though they were really the ones on trial. But it was established that blackmailing of the disreputable women by the police was one of the regular features of the business. Parkhurst was now getting his innings, but he had only begun. The fight has gone on from that day to this, with an ever-increasing volume of testimony and an ever-rising tide of public indignation.

Mr. Nicoll got tired and withdrew, and, in the language of the poet of the Sierras, "the subsequent proceedings interested him no more." He gave way to Mr. Fellows, and resumed his private practice, but the battle went on all the same until last Tuesday, when the thundering victory for decent and honest government took place. Mr. Nicoll made himself largely responsible for the result by "waking up the wrong passenger." If he had not laid that sermon before the grand jury, and if that complacent body had not censured Dr. Parkhurst for preaching it, very likely Tammany would still be in con-

trol of this metropolis. Mr. Nicoll can now see the significance of the Presbyterian hymn which says:

"O Lord, on what a slender thread
"Hang everlasting things."

Note by Author

THE foregoing article was submitted to Dr. Parkhurst, for his criticism. The following letter was received in response:

HOTEL ANSONIA
73RD STREET AND BROADWAY,
NEW YORK CITY.

Nov. 30, 1914.

JAMES A. SCRYMSEER, ESQ.,
66 Broadway,
City.

MY DEAR MR. SCRYMSEER:

I have read your historical sketch with gratification and with grateful surprise. There is nothing to be added to it and nothing subtracted; and no emendations. The determining part which you played at the psychological moment the public little suspected. The "Monday morning in June" has always been a pre-eminently bright spot in my memory of the two years' struggle. And as for Langdon Erving, too much prominence cannot possibly be given to the moral heroism evinced by him all the way through. I trust poor Nicoll will have an opportunity to read at least the closing paragraph. Fellows (Nicoll's successor) would have been too keen to commit so far-reaching a blunder.

Yours with warm esteem and grateful regard,

(Signed) C. H. PARKHURST.

Public Schools in New York

IN 1894 I was Vice-President of the New York Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor. At a meeting of the Board of that Association, I read a clipping from the *New York World* to the effect that there were, at that time, ten thousand children in the City of New York (Borough of Manhattan) who could not obtain sittings in the public schools.

A School Inspector, a member of the Board, promptly denied the correctness of the *World's* statement and stoutly maintained that there were ample accommodations for the children of school age in the public school buildings of New York.

Despite the disclaimer of the School Inspector, it seemed to me that the statement of *The World* called for some action by our Board and, accordingly, I offered a motion that a special committee be appointed to thoroughly investigate the true condition in regard to the seating capacity of the public schools. The motion was carried and the special committee appointed, I being made its Chairman. The day following my appointment, I called at the office of the Board of Education and there had an interview with the Auditor of the Board, Major Balch. I explained what I wanted but the Major replied that, under the rules of the Board of Education, he was not permitted to discuss such questions in the office. He generously volunteered, however, to call at my house and give me some information on the subject.

He dined with us a few evenings later and we discussed the question of school accommodations very fully. Major Balch brought with him an official statement which Mayor Grant had published on the subject. I found the statement somewhat vague, and I judged, from my conversation with Major Balch, that the reports and estimates which had been laid before the Board of Education, for the Board's information, were mainly mere guesswork.

It was clear to me that Major Balch was convinced that, in-

stead of ten thousand, there were at least one hundred thousand children at that time who could not be accommodated in the public schools. Major Balch told me that during the entire two terms of Mayor Grace only *eight thousand sittings* had been added to the school system, despite the fact that statistics of the Health Department showed that the natural annual growth of the school population had been, for several years, over ten thousand. The Major told me that both in Boston and in Chicago a school census had been taken annually for a number of years and that New York, up to that time, had never taken a school census. I learned afterwards that the cost of such a census in Boston was about \$3,000 and in Chicago, less than \$12,000.

Personally, I gathered considerable information upon the subject, for inclusion in our Committee's report to the Association. The information all tended to show that there were, at that time, over one hundred thousand children in the city who could not be accommodated in the public schools.

The data which I had secured from Major Balch, and from other sources, were finally submitted to a committee of influential gentlemen, who were astounded at the disclosures. Together, we arranged for a meeting at Carnegie Hall to give proper publicity to the matter. The meeting was a success and proved to be a mighty force in awakening the public to a knowledge of the true condition of affairs. Hon. James C. Carter presided and, upon assuming the duties of Chairman, made a telling address and an appeal in behalf of the public schools of New York. He was followed by Rev. Dr. James M. King, Hon. Frederick W. Holls, Bishop Andrews and, finally, Hon. Abram S. Hewitt, ex-Mayor of New York.

Mayor Hewitt made a speech quite up to his high-water mark. There was one stinging epigram in it. Speaking of the children shut out of the public schools and growing up in ignorance, he said: "They are being prepared for a career of *crime*—or *politics*." There was a little pathos in Mr. Hewitt's voice as he boasted that he was a public school boy—had never attended any other—and that he had won admission to the grammar school of Columbia College as a prize boy and had won also a public school scholarship in Columbia College. "Not as an act of charity," he passionately declared, "but as an assertion of my right."

At the meeting in question sub-committees were appointed, composed of Hon. Levi P. Morton, Hon. James C. Carter, Hon. William L. Strong, Hon. Abram S. Hewitt, R. Fulton Cutting, J. Augustus Johnson, Rev. Dr. James M. King, Charles Loring Brace, Dorman B. Eaton, William H. Parsons, William Fellowes Morgan, Wheeler H. Peckham, Rev. Wm. R. Huntington, D.D., Cornelius N. Bliss and many others of like prominence. Through the powerful influence of these well-known citizens, wide-spread interest was awakened, which continues to this day, in behalf of our public schools.

Hugh J. Grant was Mayor of New York at this time and I imagine that he did not find much comfort in reading the accounts of the meeting. Progress was slow in Mayor Grant's administration, but when Grant was succeeded by William L. Strong we knew that earnest efforts would be made to better conditions. Mayor Strong was my neighbor at Seabright and I had frequent opportunities to discuss with him this matter of public school accommodations. He became greatly interested in the subject from the start and one of his earliest official acts was to order a school census to be taken by the police. Of course, there was strenuous opposition to the use of the police for this purpose and much "righteous indignation" over the expense involved—for blanks, stationery and pencils! Mayor Strong announced that he would personally pay all of these expenses out of his own pocket and this he did later—bills to the amount of \$1,000 as I now recall.

Naturally, a census taken by the police could not be absolutely accurate; the result showed, however, that the Auditor of the Board of Education was quite correct in his estimates and confirmed my surmise that the shortage of accommodations in the public schools of New York City largely exceeded one hundred thousand sittings.

The first official school census taken in New York was in the year 1895 and was the result of the new law requiring the taking of a school census every two years, passed mainly through the efforts of the New York Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor. This official census fully substantiated the census taken by the police. By the official census, it was found, if I remember correctly, that there were fifty thousand children be-

tween the ages of eight and sixteen who could not have been accommodated in the public schools if a compulsory attendance law were in force. Adding to this figure the number of children between five and seven years of age, there would have been a total population of children of school age in excess of accommodations estimated at one hundred and thirty-three thousand children. The Board of Managers all realized that it was useless to fight poverty when the children of the poor were thus neglected.

Mayor Strong was most active in his efforts to provide sufficient sittings for *all* of the children of school age. During his administration, appropriations of many million dollars were made to this end and like large appropriations have been made ever since. I am told that the total amount appropriated for new public schools, from the time of Mayor Strong to the present, amounts to millions of dollars. Notwithstanding this enormous expenditure, we read in the press every year that accommodations are still inadequate and that many scholars can be cared for only half a day.

The City of New York and, particularly, the boys and girls of New York, owe an immense debt of gratitude to Mayor Strong. His interest in the public school system of New York and his work to better conditions have never been appreciated. If the public schools had been forced to depend upon Tammany's support, it is probable that tens of thousands of children would have been deprived of the education which the American public school system guarantees to them. I count it an especial privilege, in this book of a few personal reminiscences, to call to mind the great service which William L. Strong, as Mayor, rendered to the people of New York, and I only regret that those services cannot be given the full publicity which they deserve. I repeat, that Mayor Strong was most active in his efforts to provide sufficient sittings for all of the children and am glad to "put in the record" a letter which I received from Mayor Strong:

CITY OF NEW YORK,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,

November 27, 1896.

DEAR MR. SCRYMSER:

Referring to the conversation on the occasion of your Committee's recent call upon me at the City Hall, in the matter

of public schools, I write to supplement it and explain more fully my ideas in the matter of providing ample and suitable school accommodations for all children who desire to attend. And in doing this I am fully sensible of the very keen interest which you have always manifested in the work of the various charitable organizations throughout the City, and of the splendid results accomplished through these agencies.

The recent letter I addressed to the churches of this City, through their pastors and trustees, had a double purpose. *First*: I sought to provide immediate accommodations for all the school children in this City, and the second and no less important reason in my mind was to arouse the interest of our citizens throughout the churches and elsewhere to the vital necessity of this City's providing such thorough school facilities that no child might be deprived of the benefits of our common school system.

It is perfectly apparent that to provide sufficient school accommodations will necessitate an increased expenditure of the City's money above what it has been customary to make during recent years. It is not unlikely that such an expenditure would increase the tax rate. Nor, on the other hand, is it a debatable proposition that the city of New York must not fall behind other cities in the respect that it can and should furnish not only the physical accommodations necessary for housing every child of a school age, but maintain a system of education second to none. I believe that in pursuing such a course it would, in fact, be economical for the City, as it would rob the almshouses and charitable institutions of many of their inmates, and establish a feeling of pride and progress in the rising generation that would make them self-respecting and self-supporting.

Until the last day of my administration, and even thereafter, I intend in every possible way to keep the subject of our public schools before our citizens, and to leave no effort unmade to make the school buildings and the school system of New York what it should be: first and foremost in the country.

In such a line of conduct I know I have your support, and believe that these efforts will commend themselves to every thoughtful conscientious and patriotic citizen.

Very respectfully yours,

W. L. STRONG, *Mayor*.

JAMES A. SCRYMSER, ESQ., *Chairman*.

Many wondered at the time why such indifference was shown to the welfare of the children of school age and why proper accommodation for *all* of the children was not provided.

Over one hundred thousand children deprived of an education! If these children could not be properly provided for, where were they to turn? Well, from subsequent events, I judge that it was planned to send many of them to the parochial schools and to give to the latter certain financial support, which the public schools had failed to receive, prior to the election of Mayor Strong. As an evidence of this, let me cite the fact that the Rev. Dr. James M. King, who had gone to Albany as an agent of our Special Committee to promote a School Census Bill for all of the large cities in the State of New York, accidentally discovered a most ingenious scheme of legislation, intended to benefit the Parochial Schools.

It was in early December that Dr. King discovered the two Bills in the Legislature, to which I refer. The first Bill provided for an appropriation of State funds to be disbursed in all school districts *where the public school accommodations were found to be insufficient!* The appropriation was to be upon a per capita basis, figured on the average annual cost of each pupil in the public schools for the year previous. The second Bill was a compulsory attendance act, providing that all school children of school age should be compelled, from the first of January next, to apply for school sittings. It is unnecessary to point out that this well planned scheme, to call it by no other name, would have met with the approval of the public, the latter probably being willing to accept parochial schools rather than no schools at all. Fortunately this ingenious scheme was discovered in time, and, as will be seen, was defeated.

It was about this time that the Hon. Levi P. Morton was overwhelmingly elected Governor of New York, on the Republican ticket. At that election the voters authorized the holding of a Constitutional Convention. Among the New York City delegates to this convention were Hon. Joseph H. Choate, Hon. Elihu Root, Hon. John Bigelow and others of prominence. The attention of the convention was called to the legislative scheme which I have mentioned, allowing the Parochial Schools to receive State money by authority of the State Legislature.

Our representative, the Rev. Dr. King, appeared before the convention and presented the matter so forcibly and so ably that a proposed amendment to the Constitution was prepared, pro-

hibiting the use of public moneys for either sectarian or charitable societies. The meetings of the Convention were, in consequence, besieged by priests from all over the State and these priests did everything possible to prevent the adoption of anything which would interfere with the proposed State appropriation for sectarian schools or charities.

I have been told by those who were present at the Convention that the original amendment, which included charities, was doomed to defeat and that only through the skilful action of the Chairman, Mr. Choate, and Mr. Root, on the floor, was the proposed amendment re-committed and finally reported with the charities feature eliminated. The re-drafted amendment was confined exclusively to the prohibition of the use of State moneys for sectarian schools, and, even then, was adopted by only a bare majority of the delegates. It was a fight and we were successful but by a mighty slender margin.

Hon. Frederick W. Holls was the author of the amendment to the Constitution. The clause read:

(From the Amended New York State Constitution.)

Article IX. Section 1. The Legislature shall provide for the maintenance and support of a system of free common schools, wherein all the children of this State may be educated.

Section 4. Neither the State nor any subdivision thereof, shall use its property or credit or any public money, or authorize or permit either to be used, directly or indirectly, in aid or maintenance, other than for examination or inspection of any school or institution of learning wholly or in part under the control or direction of any religious denomination, or in which any denominational tenet or doctrine is taught.

It is to be hoped that the clause will remain in the Constitution of the State of New York for all time.

We had planned this fight at a meeting at my house at which Bishop Henry C. Potter presided. At that meeting we raised an ample fund for expenses.

Sixteen years later, in 1912, I received a letter from an old friend and co-worker, Mr. J. Augustus Johnson, which brought to mind our early fight for the public schools of New York. Perhaps it will not be out of place for me to publish Mr. Johnson's letter.

Here it is:

THE LEGAL AID SOCIETY

NEW YORK, Oct. 21, 1912.

MR. JAMES A. SCRYMSER,
66 Broadway,
New York City.

MY DEAR MR. SCRYMSER:

Your continued interest in the public schools of New York encourages me to enlist your co-operation in securing an adequate force of teachers *in the night schools* for the instruction of the English language to resident immigrants. The proposed budget for the City is now under consideration, and it is feared that the provision for twenty-eight additional teachers for such night schools will be stricken out from motives of economy.

You first called my attention to the needs of the school system many years ago, when the schools lacked playgrounds, adequate seating capacity, capable trustees and ventilation, and to the proximity of saloons and other corrupting influences. At your request, I attended and spoke at a large meeting held at Carnegie Hall, for the promotion of a school census. You will remember, too, that as President of the Good Government Club Council, and of Club E, I named a Committee on Public Schools, whose auxiliary committee of seven ladies blossomed into the Public School Association, with seven hundred members of great activity and usefulness. Among other results was an appropriation of fifteen millions for the public school system of the City made by the Legislature.

It was your quiet and pervasive influence in building up the modern school system that gave the needed impetus and stimulus to the great reforms which followed, and I hope you may long be spared to see that system fully developed and made available for the millions of immigrants who must be instructed to prevent their becoming a menace.

Yours sincerely,

J. AUGUSTUS JOHNSON,
of South Orange, N. J.

The outcome of the campaign for the enlargement and betterment of public school facilities in New York City was an awakening of wide-spread interest in the entire school system and resulted in the organization of the original Public School Association, to which Mr. Johnson refers in his letter, in the Kindergarten Association, the Vacation Schools and in many other organizations formed for the welfare of teachers and scholars.

One good work, resulting from the campaign, I feel that I

must mention, and that is, the association which was planned and managed so efficiently by Miss Grace H. Dodge, Miss Helen Iselin, Mrs. Edward R. Hewitt, Miss S. M. Minturn, and Miss Jane B. Potter. This association provided art students and school teachers with a free round trip of ten days to the World's Fair, at Chicago. In all, one hundred and sixty-six women were provided for. The trips were taken under the guidance of capable matrons both in New York and Chicago. In Chicago a furnished house was secured and the tourists were provided with every comfort. Every detail was superbly managed and even the departure of trains from New York was so timed that each party had a morning view of Niagara Falls. Each tourist was provided with an accident insurance policy, covering all risks from the time of leaving until the return to New York. Happily not an accident of any kind occurred to any of the guests of the Association.

Mention is made of this interest in the art student and teacher because it was undoubtedly the beginning of a wider interest which has since been evidenced all over the country in the welfare of the teacher as well as of the scholar. Parent and Teachers' associations now exist throughout the land and are doing much to improve the relations between teacher and scholar and to foster cooperation between the home and the school.

Much of this work for school betterment and wider interest in the schools had its origin in the reading of the clipping from the *New York World* mentioned on page 126.

Vacation Schools

WHEN I was Vice-President of the New York Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor, I had the privilege of inaugurating the first Summer Vacation Schools. I was opposed by certain members of the Board on the ground that solicitation for funds to pay the expenses of these Vacation Schools would impair the regular contributions upon which the Association depended. Happily, the public subscribed several thousand dollars in excess of the estimated expenses and the solicitation for funds did not impair, in any way, the regular contributions toward the Association's work.

The first Vacation Schools were started in the Summer of 1894. The Board of Education assigned to our Association four school buildings, the Association agreeing to pay all expenses, for janitors, teachers, etc. The schools were open for six weeks and there was an attendance of 28,000 out of 31,000 enrolled. The total cost was less than \$4,000. The Vacation Schools were a success from the start. In 1895 the Board of Education gave us the use of six school buildings.

I endeavored to keep the work entirely independent of any so-called "Fresh Air Work." After the closing of the schools it was arranged that the "Vacation School" children should have an outing to Coney Island, to be paid for by private subscription.

I remember that we charged the children of ten years and over ten cents each for the excursion and the children under ten years five cents, we paying all other expenses, and I have always felt that the wonderful success of these excursions was due to the fact that the children themselves contributed toward the cost of the same. I have neither time nor space to speak of the great success of these Vacation Schools. To-day there are many in the City of New York and, following New York's example, similar schools have been established in all of the large cities of the United States and Canada and, to a large extent, in England and her colonies.

When I suggested such sessions, I was impressed by the fact that all of our school buildings were standing unoccupied in the Summer months, yet the children were running in the streets, with nowhere else to go. I felt that by opening the school buildings the children would have an opportunity for recreation as well as for instruction. We are gradually learning much in this country in the matter of a wider use of our public school buildings.

The splendidly equipped Manual Training and Vocational Schools throughout the country, the great Recreation Centers in the large cities, and the marvelous Playgrounds, established in hundreds of places, undoubtedly had their inception in the Vacation School movement inaugurated, as I have described, over twenty years ago.



UNITED CHARITIES BUILDING, NEW YORK CITY

United Charities Building


SHORTLY after I became a member of the Board of Managers of the New York Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor, I became deeply impressed with the fact that the Association's headquarters at 79 Fourth Avenue was wholly inadequate for its growing work. At a Board meeting, in the Summer of 1892, I referred to this fact and strongly advocated the securing of new and larger quarters. I had long been of the opinion that the influential charity organizations in the city, each specializing in a measure, could do far better administrative work if they were all quartered in one building, a building confined exclusively to the work of charitable societies; in other words, a UNITED CHARITIES BUILDING.

My propositions—for new quarters and a United Charities Building—met with instant favor and the Board appointed a Special Committee to confer with like special committees from the other societies who were to be invited to join in the conference. These other societies were the Charity Organization Society, the Children's Aid Society and the City Mission and Tract Society, and their respective managers were equally enthusiastic over the project.

Our Joint Committee was successful in raising \$160,000 when, unfortunately, the upset in financial circles, caused by the failure of Baring Brothers and Company of London, put a stop to any further subscriptions. At about this time, I was luncheoning at the Downtown Club with Robert W. deForest, another member of the Joint Committee, and both of us were in a depressed state of mind because of our failure to raise the required \$500,000 for our United Charities Building. We discussed pros and cons, ways and means, but without avail. During our conversation, I was surprised to see Mr. deForest suddenly leave the table. As he left he hurriedly remarked to me "There is the man we want," pointing to one of New York's foremost citizens, John S. Kennedy.

Mr. deForest rejoined me shortly with a smile on his face, telling me that Mr. Kennedy had said that our United Charities Building project should not fail and that, if we would find a suitable location, he (Mr. Kennedy) would personally undertake the establishment of a suitable building. This news was certainly good news and was received with delight. Within a week, we had secured an option on five city lots, on the corner of Fourth Avenue and Twenty-second Street and, within a year thereafter, the United Charities Building was completed and occupied by the Charity Organization Society, the Children's Aid Society, the City Mission and Tract Society and the New York Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor.

Later, the original building and subsequent additions were formally deeded to the four organizations which I have named, as a gift from Mr. Kennedy, the said organizations agreeing to share jointly in the expense of repairs and upkeep, as well as to participate in all rentals from other charitable societies admitted as tenants in the building. This magnificent gift of John S. Kennedy, costing over one million dollars, has been of untold value to the charitable institutions of New York City, promoting, as it has, co-operation and close association, thus making possible both reduced expenses and largely increased facilities for the carrying on of the charitable work of New York.



THE MEMORIAL TO THE HEROIC WOMEN OF THE CIVIL WAR, WASHINGTON, THE PERMANENT
HEADQUARTERS OF THE AMERICAN RED CROSS

Memorial Building in Washington

To the Memory of the Heroic Women of the Civil War
To be Occupied Permanently by the American Red Cross

ON page 13, I mentioned that my friend General Barlow, just before his death, prophesied that the time would come when one of the finest monuments in the country would be built to the memory of the women of the Civil War and I promised him that I would do all I could to further that project.

Many times the memory of this conversation came back to me and, in the Fall of 1911, I determined to see what I could do toward the fulfilment of General Barlow's prophesy and my promise to him. Accordingly, on October 4, 1911, I attended a meeting of the Commandery of the State of New York of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, of which Commandery I was a member. Toward the end of the meeting, when new business was in order, I told my companions of the Loyal Legion of my last interview with General Barlow and, also, what I knew of the services and sacrifices of Mrs. Barlow and other loyal northern women in the Civil War.

Recalling General Barlow's prophesy, I proposed that the New York Commandery of the Loyal Legion should take the initiative and launch a project for the building of a National Monument in the City of Washington to the memory of the loyal women who, in the Civil War, as mothers and wives so heroically devoted themselves to our sick and wounded soldiers on the battlefield and in the hospital. I proposed that the sum of five hundred thousand dollars be raised to build such a monument, and personally guaranteed fifty thousand dollars upon condition that three hundred thousand dollars be raised within one year from

that date. The proposal met with the instant favor of my companions and a Resolution was formally adopted to further the project.

It was voted to place the project in the hands of a Special Committee, to be termed the Committee on Ways and Means. Of this Committee, I was made the Chairman and my associates were Major-General Frederick D. Grant, General Thomas H. Hubbard, General J. Fred Pierson, Major J. Langdon Ward, Lieut. Loyall Farragut and Lieut. Thomas Sturgis. The Committee on Ways and Means voted to send a copy of the Resolution to the Loyal Legion Commanderies of the country, to the Grand Army of the Republic, to the Woman's Relief Corps of the Grand Army of the Republic and to all kindred associations, asking all to co-operate with the Commandery of the State of New York in the collecting of subscriptions for the building of the Monument.

A Committee of Patriotic Citizens, embracing the prominent men and women of New York, was formed to give impetus and publicity to the project. Thousands of circulars were dispatched all over the country, giving details of the project and quoting in full an eloquent address by the Hon. James M. Beck, entitled "The American Women in the Civil War," delivered at the Dinner of the New York Commandery of the Loyal Legion held at Delmonico's, October 4, 1911.

In addition to the above the following appeals were mailed broadcast, the first addressed "To All Patriotic Men and Women," and the second to the "Veteran Soldiers and Sailors of the Civil War;" the latter through the indirect but friendly co-operation of the Pension Bureau in Washington. These patriotic appeals were both composed by my friend, Hon. H. D. Estabrook, of New York.

Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States
COMMANDERY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
Headquarters, No. 140 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y.
Telephone 4474 Beekman

"Lest We Forget"

An Opportunity

TO HELP TO BUILD

A National Monument in the City of Washington

TO THE MEMORY OF

THE LOYAL WOMEN OF THE CIVIL WAR

WHO SERVED IN THEIR HOMES, ON THE BATTLE-FIELDS, AND IN THE HOSPITALS

TO ALL PATRIOTIC MEN AND WOMEN

THIS project has lain dormant in the public conscience for fifty years awaiting some initiative to bring it to fruition. Every patriotic citizen of the United States should heartily approve the undertaking; and it follows that if each will express his, or her, approval by a contribution, however small, the necessary funds will be forthcoming, and the monument will be built to stand for all time a worthy symbol of the Nation's gratitude.

This appeal for funds is national—to each and to every one!

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,

MAJOR-GENERAL FREDERICK D. GRANT
GENERAL THOMAS H. HUBBARD
GENERAL J. FRED PIERSON
MAJOR J. LANGDON WARD
CAPT. JAMES A. SCRYMSEY
LIEUT. LOYALL FARRAGUT
LIEUT. THOMAS STURGIS

Contributions may be forwarded to the Secretary and Treasurer,

A. NOEL BLAKEMAN, *Recorder*,

140 Nassau Street, New York City,

By check or postal money order.

Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States
COMMANDERY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
Headquarters, No. 140 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y.
Telephone 4474 Beekman

Attention ! !

VETERAN SOLDIERS AND SAILORS OF THE CIVIL WAR,
WE ASK FOR FUNDS TO BUILD
A National Monument in the City of Washington
TO THE MEMORY OF
THE LOYAL WOMEN OF THE CIVIL WAR
WHO SERVED IN THEIR HOMES, ON THE BATTLE-FIELDS, AND IN THE HOSPITALS

COMRADES:

These women were yours—your mothers, your sisters, and your wives. You know that they were your co-equals in labor and more than your equals in bitterness of sorrow; for in your absence at the front they bore your burdens on their shoulders and your sufferings in their hearts. Will you quit the battle-field of life and leave no enduring expression of your appreciation? Here is your holy privilege, not to be relegated to others. Give, therefore, as you are able; give even from your poverty. Give now, for the last roll-call is near. Forgetfulness is injustice. Remembrance is a sacred duty.

Fraternally yours,

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,

MAJOR-GENERAL FREDERICK D. GRANT
GENERAL THOMAS H. HUBBARD
GENERAL J. FRED PIERSON
MAJOR J. LANGDON WARD
CAPT. JAMES A. SCRYMSER
LIEUT. LOYALL FARRAGUT
LIEUT. THOMAS STURGIS

Contributions may be forwarded to the Secretary and Treasurer,

A. NOEL BLAKEMAN, *Recorder*,

140 Nassau Street, New York City,

By check or postal money order.

We labored strenuously to raise the required amount but in the end, were unsuccessful. The other State Commanderies of the Loyal Legion, with one or two exceptions, did not support the project at all.

In the original circulars I merely used the words "National Monument" and did not undertake to specify just what form this monument should take. In the course of time I became of the opinion that the most appropriate form for the "finest monument in the country" would be an administration building, in Washington, for the permanent headquarters of the American Red Cross, a building which would stand for all time as a symbol of the Nation's gratitude to the loyal women of the Civil War.

When I saw that the Loyal Legion could not hope to raise the required amount, I suggested to the Committee that we make arrangements with the American Red Cross for a joint undertaking. The Committee concurred and, through Mr. Robert W. deForest, the Vice-President of the American Red Cross, arrangements were finally made whereby the Red Cross was to obtain from Congress an appropriation for a proper site in Washington for a Monumental Building to be built by the Loyal Legion Commandery of the State of New York and its friends and to be occupied and maintained by the American Red Cross as its Headquarters.

Our formal announcement to this effect was as follows:

Announcement

THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS
of the
COMMANDERY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
of the
MILITARY ORDER OF THE LOYAL LEGION
OF THE UNITED STATES

are pleased to announce to the members of the New York Commandery and to all interested in the project for

A National Monument in the City of Washington

TO THE MEMORY OF
THE LOYAL WOMEN OF THE CIVIL WAR, WHO
SERVED IN THEIR HOMES, ON THE
BATTLE-FIELDS, AND IN THE HOSPITALS

that permanent arrangements have been made with

THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS

whereby the RED CROSS is to obtain from the Congress of the United States an appropriation for a proper site for a Monumental Building to be built by the Commandery of the State of New York and its friends, and perpetually occupied and maintained by the RED CROSS as its Headquarters, which monumental building shall stand for all time as a symbol of the Nation's gratitude to the loyal women of the Civil War.

Thus the patriotic and humane spirit of the women who created the Sanitary Commission, which cared for our Soldiers and Sailors during the War, descends upon the RED CROSS, which will, with its efficient organization, care for all sufferers in time of disaster.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,

GENERAL STEWART L. WOODFORD
GENERAL THOMAS H. HUBBARD
GENERAL J. FRED PIERSON
MAJOR J. LANGDON WARD
CAPTAIN JAMES A. SCRYMSE
LIEUT. LOYALL FARRAGUT
LIEUT. THOMAS STURGIS
CAPTAIN JAMES A. SCRYMSE, *Chairman*
66 Broadway, N. Y.

Contributions may be forwarded to the Secretary and Treasurer,

JOHN L. MERRILL,
Room 1900, 66 Broadway, New York City.

By check or postal money order.

I received the following letter from President Taft, heartily approving of the new arrangement:

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

Dear Captain Scrymser:

I most heartily approve of the project of the Commandery of the State of New York of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States to build in the City of Washington a National Monument to the Memory of the Loyal Women of the Civil War, which shall become in perpetuity the headquarters of the American National Red Cross.

Memorials to the men of the Civil War are prominent throughout the country, and shall our people be less grateful to the women who labored at home, on the battle-field, and in the hospitals with a patriotic devotion unexcelled, and who, in giving those they loved, made even a greater sacrifice?

What better monument could we build to those noble women than a building at the National Capitol to perpetuate their heroic effort to relieve the human suffering which inevitably follows war or any great calamity, and which found its first expression in the great Sanitary Commission of our Civil War? For it was on women's initiative that this Sanitary Commission was inaugurated, and its success was largely due to their tireless efforts. The splendid work of this American organization was recognized by the Convention of Geneva in 1864, when the International Red Cross Treaty was enacted.

Upon the American Red Cross has fallen the mantle of the Sanitary Commission. The loyal and patriotic spirit of the women to whom this memorial is built will be forever perpetuated in the humane work of the Red Cross, to which they gave the initial impulse.

As President Lincoln so truly said, "If all that has been said by orators and poets since the creation of the world in praise of women were applied to the women of America, it would not do them justice for their conduct during the war."

I wish the project the success it deserves.

Very truly yours,

WM. H. TAFT.

CAPTAIN JAMES A. SCRYMSER, *Chairman*,
66 Broadway,
New York City.

It was hoped, and expected, that the plan would appeal to the public.

A Bill was introduced in both Houses of Congress, authorizing the Government purchase of such a site upon the raising of the sum of \$300,000 by the Commandery of the State of New York for the building, the latter sum having been guaranteed.

The original appropriation for the site was fixed at \$300,000 but the Library Committee of the Senate and the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds *voluntarily* increased this sum to \$400,000. Both of these committees were much interested in the memorial project and, also, in the great work of the American Red Cross, at home and abroad, and appeared to appreciate thoroughly the appropriateness of the memorial and the need of such headquarters.

A Bill appropriating the sum of \$400,000 *unanimously* passed the United States Senate on August 12, 1912, and the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds unanimously and *favorably* approved a like Bill in the House of Representatives, thus placing the same on the calendar for the consideration of the House at its next Session in December, 1912. It was unfortunate for the project that the Bill in question went over to that Session. On the night of February 26, 1913, the Bill was discussed in the Senate three and one-half hours. The debate was largely on the retention of the word "Loyal," and a new bill was substituted, excluding "*The Loyal Women of the Civil War*" and the *Loyal Legion* by a vote of forty ayes to twenty-four nays. Senator Root finally succeeded in having the latter vote reconsidered and secured the passage of the original Bill by a vote of thirty ayes to twenty nays and the appropriation was placed in the Senate Appropriation Bill, which, in turn, was referred to the Committee of Conferees from both bodies. It was there defeated by a majority voting to omit the obnoxious word "*Loyal*."

We, of the Loyal Legion, finally concluded to abandon the project because of the adverse action of Congress.

Our formal withdrawal is embodied in the attached letter which I addressed to Miss Mabel T. Boardman of the American Red Cross:

Commandery of the State of New York
Military Order of the Loyal Legion
of the United States

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Office of Chairman
CAPTAIN JAMES A. SCRYMSER
66 Broadway, New York
Telephone, 649 Rector

March 20th, 1913.

MISS MABEL T. BOARDMAN:

Member of the Executive Committee,
American Red Cross,
State, War and Navy Building,
Washington, D. C.,

MY DEAR MISS BOARDMAN:

The recent debate in Congress and the action of the Conference Committee in defeating the Senate Bill, providing for a Memorial to the Memory of the Loyal Women of the Civil War, because of the inclusion in the Bill of the word "Loyal," forces me to the conclusion that further effort in Congress upon the part of the Loyal Legion will endanger the welfare of the American Red Cross.

It is unnecessary for me to say to you that this conclusion is reached with painful regret upon the part of myself and my associates.

The project, in its inception, was based upon the highest patriotic motives and it is deplorable that those very motives should be the cause of its defeat and that our efforts to pay a long deferred debt of gratitude to the memory of the loyal women of the Civil War, to whom the Nation and we owe so much, should have been frustrated in such a manner.

Under these circumstances, it would be unwise to allow the Memorial project to interfere, in any way, with the future of the American Red Cross and, in consequence, the Loyal Legion does, with deep regret, hereby withdraw entirely from any connection with the American Red Cross, for the reason that, if continued, the American Red Cross and the services of the noble, loyal women of the Civil War, might again become the battleground of an unjust and acrimonious debate.

I, therefore, ask that your Executive Committee accept this formal withdrawal of the Commandery of the State of New York of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States from its association with the American Red Cross and that your Board will accept, at the same time, our most hearty thanks for the devoted services which you and your associates have rendered to the good work, which we have all had so much at heart.

With a personal expression of my sincere appreciation of your unselfish and devoted work and my deep regret over the outcome, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

JAMES A. SCRYMSER,
Chairman.

The subscriptions were returned to the original subscribers and our Loyal Legion project was abandoned.

I wish to record my sincere appreciation of the untiring patriotic efforts of the Hon. Elihu Root, Senator from New York, and Hon. Theodore E. Burton, Senator from Ohio, who so ably supported the project at all times. Also, my warm appreciation of the services of Miss Mabel T. Boardman, of the American Red Cross, who labored loyally and zealously for the project. Upon my urgent request, Miss Boardman has allowed me to publish her picture herewith, upon which she has written

To Mr. James A. Scrymser with sincere
gratitude for turning into marble
a Red Cross castle in the air.

Miss Boardman asked for my photograph in return and this I sent to her, with the following inscription

Re Building
In memory of the Heroic Women of the Civil War
and for
The American Red Cross

My dear Miss Boardman:

In 1913 you turned defeat into victory and won the admiration and esteem of your dearest foes. Accept my congratulations and counterpart.

JAMES A. SCRYMSER.

Although the Loyal Legion was unsuccessful in its original plan, I am glad to be able to say that the Memorial Building in Washington will be an accomplished fact before many months and that it is to be built in accordance with the original plans adopted by the Loyal Legion.

A new Bill was introduced in Congress and, through the activity of Miss Boardman of the American Red Cross, and her associates, passed, appropriating the sum of four hundred thousand



To Mr. James A. Seymour with sincere
gratitude for turning *Carto* into a Red
Cross Castle in the city - Mabel J. Boardman.

dollars toward the purchase of a site, conditional upon the raising of a like amount by the Red Cross for the erection of a building. The latter four hundred thousand dollars was contributed by Mrs. Russell Sage, Mrs. E. H. Harriman, the Rockefeller Foundation and myself. After the passage of the Bill, the desired site was secured by the American Red Cross. The property fronts on Seventeenth Street, Washington, and is three hundred and two feet wide and five hundred and forty feet deep.

On the opposite page is a photograph of the Memorial Building, now under course of construction. It will be a building of rare beauty and a fit companion for its nearest neighbors, the Corcoran Art Gallery, the Continental Hall of the Daughters of the American Revolution and the Pan-American Building.

The building will bear this inscription.

TO THE MEMORY OF THE HEROIC WOMEN OF THE
CIVIL WAR.

The interior of the building is to bear the following inscription:

A MEMORIAL
built by
The Government of the United States
and
Patriotic Citizens
to
The Heroic Women of the Civil War, both North
and South
Held in Loving Memory
by
a Now United Country
and
That their labors to mitigate the sufferings of the sick
and wounded in war may be forever perpetuated this
Memorial is dedicated to the service of The
American Red Cross

The inscription is not, of course, in accord with my original suggestion nor with my contention that the United States Government should have specifically honored the women who suffered so

nobly for its preservation in the dark days of its existence, but I shall ever be grateful that the American Red Cross is, at last, to have a permanent headquarters, and likewise for the fact that I personally was privileged to suggest its establishment. And I shall feel that I have partially succeeded in carrying out the prophecy of General Barlow and my promise made to that end.

The Commandery of the State of New York of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States did me the honor on May 6, 1914 to elect me its Senior Vice-Commander, in appreciation of the successful creation of the Memorial to the Heroic Women of the Civil War, as will be seen by a perusal of the following letter.

NEW YORK, March 4, 1914.

CAPTAIN JAMES A. SCRYMSER,
United States Volunteer.

MY DEAR COMPANION:

We can never forget the patriotic work that you did to secure a memorial building, to be dedicated to the loyal women of our country, and, later your generous gift to the one to be erected in Washington. The facts, with more amplified details, I presented at our first meeting of the Nominating Committee for Officers of the New York Commandery of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, this afternoon.

In offering your name for the position of Senior Vice-Commander, I read the inclosed biographical notice, and stated that the Commandery would be honored by your acceptance of the office, in connection with your association with those of the Memorial Committee in Washington. Commander Edwin Stewart, U. S. N. (retired), was nominated to succeed himself and you were unanimously nominated to the next highest office, Senior Vice-Commander. For the purpose of urging you not to decline I called at your residence this afternoon and now write to you hoping that you will accept immediately, on the receipt of the official notice from the Recorder.

Commander Stewart has presided at every meeting of the Commandery since he was elected. Even if you only remain on duty for one term of office (one year) I sincerely hope that you will permit us to place you on record among the highest officers of the largest Commandery of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States. On Wednesday next we again meet to receive the acceptances and, if possible, complete the duties of the Nominating Committee for the year 1914-1915.

Faithfully yours,
CHARLES A. LEALE,
Member of the Nominating Committee.

A formal letter from Commander Charles A. Adams, the Secretary of the Nominating Committee, notifying me of my nomination, followed the above and on May 7th I received the regular notification from the Recorder, to the effect that I had been elected Senior Vice-Commander.

In Conclusion


IN this relation of incidents and the review of half a century's activities, I wish to emphasize one fact, in closing, and that is that any successes which may have been achieved, would not have been possible had it not been for the zealous co-operation of public-spirited citizens and loyal and steadfast friends, a majority of whom have since passed away.

The memory of their cordial support and unselfish co-operation will ever be held in grateful remembrance.

J. A. S.

NEW YORK, February, 1915.





OBBS BROS.
RARY BINDING

AY 80

AUGUSTINE
FLA.

32084

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 013 763 194 5